

# STEPAN BANDERA



## Selected Works

VOLUME 1

# **BERSERKER**

---

## **BOOKS**

---



# Stepan Bandera



## PROSPECTS FOR THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION

*a collection of selected works*

Weep, my soul. Rejoice, do not  
weep. The sun of Ukraine is in  
the white cold.  
And you look for the red shadow of  
the on the black waters - look for its  
shadow, where a handful of us are. A  
small shop for prayer and hope.  
All of us are destined to die beforehand,  
because the blood of the viburnum is  
just as cool,  
It's as tart as the stuff in our veins.  
In a grey blizzard of lamentations  
These clusters of pain that fall into the  
depths, immortal misery has  
crystallised.

(V. Stus)

The name of Stepan Bandera is inextricably linked with the brightest period of the Ukrainian people's struggle for their freedom and national state. This book contains selected works by Stepan Bandera on the theory of nationalism, the organised nationalist movement, and the tasks and forms of the national liberation revolution.

## Contents.

From the publishers .....	7
Preface .....	9
My life story.....	15
The importance of the masses and their outreach. ....	29
On the problem of political consolidation .....	33
To the principles of our liberation policy.....	63
The essence, content and process of the Ukrainian revolution .....	63
The unreality of evolutionary concepts and the nature of the Bolshevik regime and system.....	67
Three phases of the revolution.....	70
The liberation concept and strategy of the revolution .....	72
The patchiness of the revolutionary struggle in the region .....	75
A word to Ukrainian nationalist revolutionaries abroad .....	99
I .....	100
II .....	105
III .....	117
IV .....	143
Ukrainian national revolution, not just anti-regime resistance .....	158
On the tenth anniversary of the creation of the OUN revolutionary leadership (10.2.1940) .....	203
The Korean War and National Liberation Policy .....	224
I .....	225
II .....	226
III .....	227
IV .....	229
V .....	230
The Front of Enslaved Nations. ....	233
The Third World War and the liberation struggle.....	245
The Western concept of political warfare against Bolshevism. ....	245
False hopes and the politics of self-deception.....	247
National revolution is the only way to liberation.....	267
Friends - Ukrainian nationalists! .....	281
Against the ideological disarmament of the liberation struggle .....	287
Propaganda of the liberation revolution against the backdrop of war .....	298
The tasks of the OUN in the modern. Tasks of the OUN in Ukraine. ....	307
There is no common language with Muscovites.....	313

The original sin of the pro-Russian concept. ....	319
Open cards .....	324
On the issue of the main personnel of the national liberation revolution .....	332
The commander is a guide (in the footsteps of Roman Shukhevych).....	341
I.....	341
II.....	343
III.....	345
IV .....	347
V.....	350
VI.....	356
Idea and Man in Ideological Movement.....	362
Why did it not come to a combining effect of Troika? .....	367
Against the falsification of liberation positions. ....	374
Ukrainian nationalism and religion.....	374
Own strength and market conditions.....	380
People without soil.....	393
For a correct understanding of the liberation and revolutionary process.....	405
No matter how great the sacrifices, the struggle is finite .....	411
Khrushchev continues his imperialist course. ....	417
Khrushchev follows in Stalin's footsteps in national policy .....	423
Khrushchev's Stalinism in Domestic Policy .....	428
Bolshevik tactics and the liberation struggle .....	441
Moscow's unchanging strategy. ....	451
First conclusions.....	455
The forgotten science .....	461
From an inexhaustible source. ....	472
Ukraine will not be Moscow's ally.....	477
Another illusion of peace .....	484
Conclusions from Recent Events and Processes for the Ukrainian Liberation Struggle .....	491
The Question of Atomic War and the Liberation Revolution.....	512
I.....	512
II.....	519
III.....	532
IV .....	540
For the completed political structure.....	550
Prospects for the Ukrainian National Liberation Revolution.....	582

1. The need for national liberation revolutionary struggle.583

2. Moscow imperialism and communism are two forms of the same enemy

.....	585
3. Possibilities for fundamental changes in the sub-Bolshevik area.....	586
4. The significance of war for national liberation.....	589
5. The Evolution of Bolshevism and Partial Achievements of the Struggle .....	605
6. The anti-Bolshevik revolution is the only way to liberation. 611	
7. The National Liberation Revolution and the Russian Anti-Communist Forces.....	621
8. Common Front of National Liberation Revolutions.....	633
9. The problem of the National Communist Front.....	643
10. Development and factors of the revolutionary process.....	655
Where the paths should converge. ....	683
At half a metre.....	692
Interview with Stepan Bandera by a German radio station in Cologne. ....	699
Speech at the fifth meeting of Ukrainians in the United States and Canada in 1954 .....	707
On the 25th anniversary of the OUN.....	714
Over the grave of Svhen Konovalts. ....	719
The first interview of the OUN leader Stepan Bandera with foreign journalists. .....	725

## From publishers

In the history of every nation, there are people who find themselves at the centre of fateful events, who become initiators, organisers and leaders of large-scale social movements. Over time, their names take on symbolic significance and serve as milestones and landmarks for future generations, which their descendants use to mark their nation's long journey to freedom. Ukraine also has such people. And through the darkness of centuries and the poisonous propaganda of occupation, the names of Ivan Mazepa, Symon Petliura, and Stepan Bandera made their way into the consciousness of the people. Even our worst enemies could not silence them, because they became part of the historical paradigm of the centuries-long Ukrainian liberation struggle: Cossacks, Khmelnytsky, Mazepa, Haidamak, Koliivshchyna, Petliura, Bandera. And the attitude to these personalities still distinguishes between Ukrainians and Little Russians, friends and enemies, fighters and slaves.

One of the brightest iconic figures in the endless line of heroes of the Ukrainian national liberation movement is Stepan Bandera

- The leader of the OUN, a theorist, organiser and symbol of the heroic and uncompromising struggle of Ukrainians for their own statehood and freedom in the 30s and 50s of the twentieth century. But only in recent years have Ukrainians, especially those in Greater Ukraine, had the opportunity to obtain objective information about this extraordinary person. Now, on the eve of 1999, when it will be 90 years since his birth and 40 years since his death at the hands of a Moscow mercenary, more and more information about his activities is becoming available. Thus, Ukraine, neglected by the occupier, is rediscovering Stepan Bandera.

However, his theoretical works on nationalism, the organised nationalist movement, and the tasks and forms of the national liberation struggle were and remain unknown to the general public.

Earlier, the occupiers "protected" Ukrainians from Stepan Bandera's works. Now, in the context of Ukraine's independence, they are parasitic on the body of the Ukrainian people they plundered for the same reasons.

The same instinct for self-preservation drives numerous "heirs" of the OUN

-The UPA in the diaspora and in the region. Heading various organisations, foundations, unions and other "facades", they inherited positions and fame, but not the holy work of their predecessors. These political imitators are not interested in disseminating Stepan Bandera's works. After all, then the gap that separates their selfish fuss from the cause for which he gave his life will become obvious to everyone.

his life as a leader. For six years - since we first got hold of Stepan Bandera's collection of selected works Prospects for the Ukrainian Revolution - we have been convincing these "leading" and "head" figures of the urgent need to republish this book. They didn't want to: some of them were dodging, some were waving us off, some are still silent.

And the need for this publication is growing. The national-state movement is expanding, nationalism is becoming the worldview of an increasing number of Ukrainians, especially young people, and Ukrainians are now closer than ever before to the cherished goal of their own national state. And it is very important that in this fateful time, the current generation can use the works of Stepan Bandera - this inexhaustible source of faith and thought, strength, inspiration and strength for every fighter for the bright destiny of Ukraine.

And now this publication has come to fruition. Many people, often far removed from organised nationalism, contributed to its creation. But we were united by the realisation of who Stepan Bandera was, is and always will be for Ukrainians. Together we did everything necessary to ensure that in the anniversary year of our Leader, his works finally returned to Ukraine. Together, we have achieved an important feat. Let us congratulate ourselves and all the readers of this book on this.

*Colonel Vasyl IVANYSHYN, Leader [of the S. Bandera Tryzub VFKPO](#)*

*Colonel Dmytro YAROSH, Head of the Central Leadership.*

*Mr Petro Bobyk, President of [the Vidrozhennia Publishing Company](#).*

## Foreword

The richness of the topics covered by Stepan Bandera in this book should not intimidate the thoughtful reader. The author's works invariably have one golden thread that runs through all his reflections and in-depth analyses of the events and processes of the Ukrainian liberation struggle. Stepan Bandera focuses his attention primarily on the comprehensive development of the prospects of the Ukrainian national liberation revolution, and this is the central theme of his intellectual work. Approaching this main topic from different points of view, analysing various aspects of it from the internal or foreign policy perspective, the author unfolds his own logical and natural ideas, which are determined by Ukrainian qualities and values, original Ukrainian firsts, revolutionary indestructible human Ukrainian potential and geopolitical position of Ukraine, its natural wealth, innate genius and diligence of the nation - the prospects for the development of the Ukrainian national liberation revolution. The iron logic of his argumentation, his foresight regarding the developmental processes stimulated by the revolutionary idea, revolutionary cadres, and revolutionary planetary action, his analysis of the internal contradictions of the empire and the system caused and deepened by revolutionary nationalist liberation actions, gives us an image not only of an anti-aircraft gun - national uprising, but also the victorious liberation war of the oppressed nations against the Russian occupier and the Bolshevik tyrannical totalitarian system. The author's focus on this main issue of Ukraine's liberation struggle does not mean that he neglects the various components of the struggle and the growth of the nation in general.

There is no important problem in the life of the nation that Stepan Bandera would not have touched upon in his rich intellectual, journalistic and publicistic work, no less in his various correspondence, the publication of which, for various reasons, will have to wait. But the essence of the matter is that in the hierarchy of values and tasks, Stepan Bandera pushed everything secondary, such as intra-party disputes, the intra-Ukrainian party-political complex, to the background, and embedded it, according to the specific weight of this phenomenon, in the great building of the successful deployment of the national liberation movement.

revolution.

He analysed comprehensively the significance of the common front of the nations enslaved by Russian imperialism and communism, united in the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Peoples (ABP), giving this common struggle special importance. The author's reliance on Ukraine's own forces in the vast camp of enslaved nations that have a vital interest in the collapse of the Russian empire and the destruction of Bolshevism is elaborated in detail as a guide not only for the revolutionary OUN. Stepan Bandera deeply understood the most intimate subtleties and possible complications of a common front of enslaved nations if it is not put on the right footing - respect for the absolute sovereignty of each partner of the common front.

The author saw the empire and the system from the inside and outside, its weakness and strength, which rather lay in the spiritual, ideological and political weakness of the free nations of the world. When exposing the policy of the so-called peaceful coexistence almost a quarter of a century ago, the author, as a political visionary, foresaw all its negative and destructive elements for free nations. His argumentation of that time can be repeated verbatim in relation to the current policy of the so-called detente.

In fact, from the point of view of a foresighted not only revolutionary and liberation leader, but also a statesman of high quality, the author reveals a real alternative to nuclear war, an alternative whose basic principles have unchanging long-term significance.

Believing that the way to liberate Ukraine and other enslaved nations is to orientate and build up their own forces of revolution, the author boldly demands that free nations not treat Ukraine and other enslaved nations as a factor that must constantly restrain the Bolshevik invasion, but, on the contrary, in their own interest, demand that they join the war of liberation of enslaved nations armed, realising its goals and recognising its bearers as masters of their own land, its sovereigns. It should be a joint war of liberation in the common interest against the Bolshevik barbaric aggression, and not an intervention by "liberators" who constantly carried new slavery on their bayonets.

The liberation revolution has always brought immeasurably fewer victims than an aggressive, imperialist war or mass murderous terror, in particular that of the Russian Bolshevik occupier. The author convincingly

He proved it.

His understanding of the national liberation revolution is not a mechanical process of deploying only technical revolutionary acts, or a reaction to oppression and persecution, but a deep, rooted in the worldview, ideological, religious, cultural, legal, social, traditional values of the Ukrainian nation and human being - a spiritual and organisational process.

The author emphasises, in particular, the first stages of the spiritual revolution, the growth of revolutionary boiling, the revolutionisation of the broad masses of the people at all levels of life, which will ultimately culminate in the zenith point: the nationwide organised armed uprising of the OUN-UPA. The Ukrainian revolution is, first and foremost, a process of internal liberation of the nation and the awakening and self-awareness of its traditional original historically inherent Ukrainian values and qualities, which are crucial in the inclusion of the broad masses in the ideological aspect, which is manifested in the action and, at the appropriate time, in the armed aspect.

He was worried about the possibility of a two-front war between Ukraine and other enslaved peoples against two variants of Russian imperialists - Bolshevik and anti-communist, supported by some Western powers. As a foresighted strategist, he comprehensively developed Ukraine's defence measures, pointing out ways to split the two-front war. The threat and danger of the so-called national-communist sabotage, against which he recommends successful recipes for counteraction, does not disappear from his outlook.

Stepan Bandera derives his theory of the liberation revolution from the deep ideological, ideological, socio-political, economic, programmatic, religious and legal principles of Christian Ukrainian revolutionary liberation nationalism with the historical people's rights peculiar to the Ukrainian nation, with the basic ideas of universal significance of "freedom for peoples" and "freedom for man", which, according to the ABN, are the goal of the liberation revolution: the breakup of the Russian Empire into independent national states of the currently enslaved peoples within their ethnographic boundaries and the destruction of the communist, tyrannical, totalitarian, mono-party system.

Stepan Bandera could not have been a prominent theorist of the Ukrainian liberation revolution if he had not also been its ideologist, because the liberation revolution is not only about technical and military mechanics, but above all about the deep spiritual, ideological, political and programmatic, national, social and political processes that create the basis for armed struggle, guerrilla, insurgent, or regular liberation war.

For Stepan Bandera, solving the problem of internal Ukrainian politics was a means of mobilising the people for the liberation and revolutionary struggle, of consolidating the revolutionary liberation potential. Therefore, his concept of an elected Ukrainian National Liberation Centre abroad should also be viewed from this perspective. It would be a mistake to assume that the author changed his fundamental views on this issue at different times in the formulation of his works. The essence of his view has always been *not* in the affirmation of this or that organisational form, institution, or centre, but in the actual suitability of this formation for cementing the revolutionary and liberation struggle, in terms of the sovereignty of Ukrainian politics and the principles of the formation of this centre, in accordance with the will of the majority of the people and the guarantee of the growth of healthy political forces that should co-create this formation.

Therefore, taking into account the totality of Stepan Bandera's views, which centred on the struggle for the success of the national liberation revolution, every national centre in Ukraine is in line with his views if it is to strengthen the revolutionary liberation struggle.

Stepan Bandera was also able to retrospectively assess the national armed contribution that saved the people from the millions of victims of terror and deportation. The unfolding and strengthening of the revolutionary potential of the two-front war of the OUN-UPA, and in particular the more than ten-year armed struggle, the national uprising of the UPA, also had a special interpreter in our historiography of recent decades.

Determination of the historical place in the new periodisation of Ukrainian history, Ukrainian statehood, restored on June 4, 1941, as a landmark on the historical path of the nation and a reference point for free

of the world's nations testifies to his ability to think in the grand historical categories of a revolutionary statesman.

Stepan Bandera was a Christian nationalist, as he constantly emphasised in his writings, believing that God and Ukraine give faith in victory and the strength to endure patience, suffering and hardship, and, if necessary, to courageously accept death.

Stepan Bandera stood for the true, traditional Ukrainian people's government, and how close he was in all his views to the heroic patriotic sixties and seventies!

Stepan Bandera was very critical of the policies of Western governments, especially those of the GCC, labelling their policies towards Ukraine in terms of their own interests. He saw in them traditional Russophilism, lack of faith in the national idea, and a commercially selfish, short-sighted approach to the essential problems of existence or non-existence of spiritual culture, the eternal values of spirit, freedom and justice for the nation and the individual.

Ideas, personnel, action - these are the three elements that permeate his liberation thinking. He was extremely tolerant of dissenting opinions, respecting the political divisions of the public, and paid special attention to the development of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN).

For the revolutionary struggle to succeed, a breakthrough avant-garde, monolithic, fanatical force with faith in its truths is needed. Ideas win when their carriers win. The OUN is an ideological and political formation that guides, mobilises, and organises the people in the struggle. Without it, without a guide, without an organisational reference point, there is no victory for the broad masses. The element itself, without rudder and sails, will not win in a fight with such a terrible enemy as Russia and its breakthrough force, the CPSU. Against the CPSU, the OUN and the ABN must stand on this side of the barricade. The OUN must also stand against the NTS and other united-divisionists. Ideas unite ideologically and spiritually, specific guidelines indicate the path of struggle, and the Organisation guarantees systematic, consistent and correct action, mobilising the broadest front of the nation. That is why Stepan Bandera so highly valued the revolutionary OUN in his writings and throughout his life of struggle. And on the way to building it, he died a hero. Whoever has lost faith in Ukrainian nationalism, whoever seeks to substitute any

The OUN's leadership is opposed to Stepan Bandera's revolutionary and liberation concept, deviating from the ideas of the great liberation revolutionary activist, who focused his thoughts the revolutionary OUN and its role as an organiser of the revolution.

Stepan Bandera's creative life was short. In concentration camps and in the basements of the worst prisons, for many years, he was forbidden to write. He could only change his mind in constant uncertainty as to whether his thoughts and ideas, concepts and plans would ever be realised.

The spiritual heritage of Stepan Bandera is extraordinary in its content. Perhaps only future historians will discover whether Stepan Bandera had a greater impact on the success of the revolutionary struggle through the heroism of his life, his actions as a nationalist revolutionary and leader of the liberation struggle, or whether his ideas and thoughts, his theory of the national liberation revolution, and his teachings had a greater impact on the success of the revolutionary struggle. However, it is hardly possible to separate the revolutionary of rank, the organiser and pragmatist of the revolution from its theorist and ideologue!

*Smetsky said.*

"In every ideological or political movement, two main components play a crucial role: the idea and the person. The leading ideas and worldview in an ideological movement and the guiding programme in a political movement create the "soul", the essence, the inner content of the movement. The people who recognise, disseminate and implement the ideas and programme, and who take an active part in the movement to this end, create its living, functioning organism."

*Smenan Bandera*

## My life story

*The massive autobiography, written in April 1959 and intended for the American Consulate General in Munich, where St. Bandera unsuccessfully tried to obtain an American visa to travel to the United States. These events are mentioned in the letters of St. Bandera's letters to Ihnat Bilynsky (27 June 1959), Prof. L. Dobriansky and others.*

*This autobiography was first published in the weekly "The Ukrainian Voice", Toronto, chap. 42/648 - 45,651 from 14 October to 4 November 1961; reprinted, with an addition by Dr Fr.*

*Vaskovych, in the collection of materials edited by Danylo Maikovsky, "The Moscow Murderers of Bandera on Trial", Ukrainian Publishing House in Munich, 1965, pp. 439-445.*

I was born on 1 January 1909 in the village of Uhryniv Saryi, Kalush County, in Galicia, which at the time belonged to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, along with two other western Ukrainian countries: Bukovyna and Zakarpattia.

My father, Andriy Bandera, a Greek Catholic priest, was at that time a parish priest in Uhryniv Saryi (the parish also included the neighbouring village of Berezhnytsia Shliakhetska). My father came from Stryi. He was the son of Mykhailo Bandera and Rosaliya, a farmer and burgher whose maiden name was

- Biletska. My mother, Myroslava Bandera, came from an old priestly family. She was the daughter of a Greek Catholic priest from Uhryniv Saryi, Volodymyr Tlodzinskyi, and Kateryna from the Kushlyk household. I was the second child of my parents. My sister Marta was older than me. The younger ones were: Oleksandr, sister Volodymyr, brother Vasyl, sister Oksana, brother Bohdan, and the youngest sister Myroslava, who died as an infant.

I lived my childhood years in Uhryniv Saryi, in the house of my parents and grandparents, growing up in an atmosphere of Ukrainian patriotism and lively national, cultural, political and social interests. There was a large library at home, and active participants in Ukrainian national life in Galicia, relatives and their friends, such as my uncles, often came together: Pavlo Tlodzinsky, one of the founders of the Maslosoyuz and the Village Master (Ukrainian economic

institutions), Yaroslav Vesolovskyi - ambassador to the Vienna parliament, sculptor M. Havrylko and others. During the First World War, as a young boy, I lived through the four times the military fronts passed through my native village in 1914-15 and 1917, and in 1917, heavy two-week battles. The Austrian-Russian front passed through Uhryniv, and our house was partially destroyed by cannon fire. At the same time, in the summer of 1917, we observed the manifestations of the revolution in the army of Tsarist Russia, national revolutionary shifts, and a great difference between Ukrainian and Moscow military units.

In October-November 1918, as a boy of less than ten years old, I experienced the exciting events of the revival and construction of the Ukrainian state. My father was one of the organisers of the coup d'état in the Kalush district (with the doctor Dr Kurivets) and I witnessed him forming military units from peasants of nearby villages, armed with weapons hidden in 1917. From November 1918 onwards, our family life was marked by events in the building of Ukrainian state life and the war of independence. My father was an ambassador to the parliament of the Western Ukrainian People's Republic - the Ukrainian National Council in Stanislaviv and took an active part in shaping state life in Kalush region. A special influence on the crystallisation of my national and political consciousness was made by the majestic celebrations and general animation of the unification of the ZUNR with the Ukrainian People's Republic into one state in January 1919.

In May 1919, Poland used General Haller's army, which had been formed and armed by the Entente powers to fight against Bolshevik Moscow, in the war against the Ukrainian state. Under its superiority, the front began to move eastwards. Along with the retreat of the Ukrainian Galician Army, our whole family moved east, moving to Yaholnytsia near Chortkiv, where we stayed. Here we stayed with my uncle (my mother's brother), Father Antonovych, who was a priest there. In Yaholnytsia, we experienced the anxious and joyful moments of the great battle of the so-called Chortkiv Offensive, which drove Polish troops westward. However, due to a lack of military supplies, the Ukrainian army's offensive was halted. The retreat had to begin again, this time across the Zbruch River. All the men in my family, including my father, as a military chaplain in the UGA, crossed the Zbruch in the middle of July 1919. The women and children remained in Yaholnytsia, where they survived the arrival of

Polish occupation. In September of the same year, my mother and her children returned to the family village of Uhryniv Stryi.

My father spent the entire history of the UGA in "Greater Ukraine" (i.e., the Naddniprians) in 1919-1920, fighting the Bolsheviks and White Moscow troops, and suffering from typhus. He returned to Galicia in the summer of 1920. At first, he took refuge before the Polish authorities because of the persecution of Ukrainian political activists. In the autumn of the same year, my father returned to his previous position as a parish priest in Uhryniv Stryi.

In the spring of 1922, my mother died of throat tuberculosis. My father was in the parish in Uhryniv Stryi 1933. In that year he was transferred to the parish in Wola Zaderewiecka, Dolyna district, and later to the village of Trostianets, also in Dolyna district (after my arrest).

In September or October 1919, I went to Stryi and, after passing the entrance exam, entered a Ukrainian gymnasium. I did not go to a public school at all, because in my village, as in many other villages in Galicia, the school had been closed since 1914 due to the teacher's call to the army and other wartime events. I received my education in the scope of the folk school in my parents' house, together with my sisters and brothers, with the help of home teachers.

The Ukrainian gymnasium in Stryi was organised and maintained at first by the Ukrainian community, and later received the right to become a public, state gymnasium. 1925, the Polish state authorities took away its autonomy and turned it into a Ukrainian department of the local Polish state gymnasium. The Ukrainian gymnasium in Stryi was of the classical type. I went through all eight grades there in the years 1919-1927, showing good academic results. In 1927 I passed the matriculation exam there.

I had the financial means to study at the gymnasium because my father's parents, who had their own farm in the same town, provided me with accommodation and maintenance. My sisters and brothers also lived there during their school days. We spent summer and holiday feriyas in the family home in Uhryniv Stryi, which was about 80 kilometres away from Stryi. Both at my father's house during the feria and at my grandfather's house during the school year, I worked the farm in my free time. In addition,

Starting from the fourth grade, I gave lectures to other students and thus earned money for my own expenses.

Education and training at the Ukrainian gymnasium in Stryi was planned and controlled by the Polish school authorities. Nevertheless, some teachers managed to introduce Ukrainian patriotic content into the compulsory system. But the main national and patriotic education of young people was provided by school youth organisations.

These were the obvious legal organisations in Stryi: Plast, a Ukrainian scouting organisation, and Sokil, a sports and movement society. In addition, there were secret circles of the underground organisation of secondary school students, which was ideologically linked to the Ukrainian Military Organisation (UVO) and had as its task to educate selected personnel in the national revolutionary spirit, to influence the general youth in this direction and to involve older students in auxiliary activities of the revolutionary underground (for example collecting money for the maintenance of the Ukrainian secret university, distributing underground Ukrainian foreign publications banned by the Polish government, countering attempts to break away from the national solidarity front - boycotts of Polish societies, transcriptions, the first elections, etc.)

I belonged to Plast since the 3rd grade of the gymnasium (since 1922); in Stryi I was in the 5th Plast kuren named after Yaroslav Osmomysl, and after matura - in the 2nd kuren of senior Plast members "Chervona Kalyna" (Red Viburnum), until the Polish state authorities banned Plast in 1930. (My previous attempts to join Plast in the 1st, 2nd grades were unsuccessful because of rheumatic joints, which I had suffered from since early childhood, I was unable to walk more than once, and in 1922 I was hospitalised for about two months for a water tumour in my knee). I belonged to the underground Organisation of Secondary School Students from the 4th grade and was a member of the leading link of the Stryi Gymnasium.

After graduating from high school and passing the matriculation exam in the middle of 1927, I tried to go to Poděbrady in the Czechoslovakia to study at the Ukrainian Economic Academy, but this plan was abandoned because I could not obtain a passport to travel abroad. That year, I stayed in my parents' house, doing household chores and cultural and educational work in my native village (I worked in the Prosvita reading room, conducted theatre and

I was a member of an amateur club and choir, founded the "Lug" movement society and was one of the founders of a cooperative). At the same time, I carried out organisational and educational work on the lines of the underground UVO in the surrounding villages.

In September 1928 I moved to Lviv and enrolled in the agronomy department of the Higher Polytechnic School. The studies at this department lasted eight semesters; the first two years in Lviv, and in the last two years most of the lectures, seminary and lab-ratio work took place in Dubliany near Lviv, where the agronomic institutions of Lviv Polytechnic were located. In addition to the current exams during the studios, the ambassadors passed the diploma exam and received a diploma as an agronomic engineer. According to the plan of my studies, I completed 8 semesters in the years 1928-29 to 1931-32, with the last two semesters in 1932-33. My studies ended with the absolute maximum of 8 semesters, and I was unable to take the diploma exam because of my political activities and imprisonment. From autumn 1928 to half of 1930 I lived in Lviv, then for two years in Dublin and again in Lviv in 1932-34. During the ferias I stayed in my father's village.

During my student years, I took an active part in organised Ukrainian national life. I was a member of the Ukrainian society of polytechnic students "Osnova" and a member of the board of the Circle of Agricultural Students. For some time, I worked in the bureau of the society "The Farmer", which was engaged in the development of agriculture in the Western Ukrainian lands. As part of the cultural and educational work of the Prosvita Society, I travelled to nearby villages in the Lviv region on Sundays and holidays to give talks and help organise other performances. In the field of youth and sports organisations, I was active primarily in Plast, as a member of the 2nd senior Plast group "Chervona Kalyna", in the Ukrainian Student Sports Club (USSC), and for some time also in the Sokil-Batko and Luh societies in Lviv. My sporting activities included running, swimming, fondling, basketball and, above all, travelling. In my free time, I enjoyed playing chess, singing in a choir and playing the guitar and mandolin. I did not smoke or drink alcohol.

During my student years, I invested most of my time and energy in revolutionary, national liberation activities. It captivated me more and more, pushing even the completion of

studies. Growing up from childhood in an atmosphere of Ukrainian patriotism and the struggle for Ukraine's state independence, I sought and found contact with the Ukrainian underground, national liberation movement, which was organised and led by the revolutionary Ukrainian Military Organisation (UVO) in the Western Ukrainian lands. I became acquainted with its ideas and activities partly through family ties, and even more so while working in the underground Organisation of Secondary School Students. In my senior year of high school, I began to perform some auxiliary tasks in the activities of the OUN: distributing its slogans, underground publications and acting as a liaison officer. I became a member of the UVO formally in 1928, being assigned to the intelligence and then propaganda departments. At the same time, I belonged to a student group of Ukrainian nationalist youth that was closely linked to the UVO. When the OUN, the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, was formed in early 1929, I immediately became a member. In the same year, I was a member of the 1st OUN Conference of the Stryi District.

My tasks in the OUN were general organisational work in the Kalush district and membership work in student cells. At the same time, I performed various functions in the propaganda department. In 1930, I was in of the department for the distribution of underground publications in the Western Ukrainian Lands, followed by the technical and publishing department, and in early 1931, the department for the delivery of underground publications from abroad. In the same year (1931), I took over the management of the entire propaganda department in the OUN Regional Executive, which was headed at the time by Ivan Tabrusevych (who died in German concentration camp Sachsen-Hausen in Oranienburg near Berlin in 1944). In 1932-33, I also served as deputy regional leader, and in the half of 1933 I was appointed to the position of regional leader of the OUN and regional commandant of the UVO in the ZUZ. (These two functions were merged in the half of 1932, when, at the Conference in Prague in July, the process of merging the UVO and the OUN was completed, so that the UVO ceased to be an independent organisation and became a military and combat reference, a general department of the OUN).

I kept in touch with the foreign authorities of UVO and OUN from 1931 using the radio of my organisational functions, travelling abroad several times by various secret routes.

In July 1932, I, along with several other delegates from the OUN's CE to the

I took part in the OUN Conference in Prague (the so-called Vienna Conference, which was the most important gathering of the OUN after the founding congress). In 1933, there were also larger conferences in Berlin and Danzig, which I also attended. In addition, at smaller conferences and meetings, I had several opportunities to discuss the revolutionary and liberation activities of the Organization with the Leader of the UVO-UN, Col. Svhen Konovalts and his closest collaborators.

During my leadership, revolutionary and liberation activities in the PZU continued mainly along the lines of the previous years, and the stronger emphasis on some areas and the weakening of others was in line with the situation and the development of the liberation movement. The following points could be noted separately:

- a) Extensive development of the membership and organisational network throughout the entire territory of the ZUS in Poland. Particular attention was paid to covering the Northwestern Lands and those areas that had been penetrated by communist work. The campaign was also launched among Ukrainians living in Polish lands, especially in larger cities. Whereas previously the organisational work had been carried out mainly by former soldiers and students, now it was carried out among all social strata, with special attention to the countryside and the working class;
- б) Systematic personnel training was organised at all organisational levels. Three main types of training were established: ideological and political, military and combat, and training in underground practice (conspiracy, intelligence, communications, etc.);
- в) In addition to the political, propaganda and militant activities of the Organisation itself, a new form of work was launched - mass actions in which the broader society took an active part, acting on the initiative, instructions and under the ideological guidance of the organisational staff. In this context, the following actions were carried out: an anti-monopoly action (boycott of products of the state tobacco and alcohol monopoly) with the expectation of a moral and political effect; a school action against Polish denationalisation policy at that time and in defence of Ukrainian schooling and national education;
- г) A second front was set up alongside the revolutionary activity against Poland as the occupier and oppressor of the Western Ukrainian lands

of the anti-Bolshevik struggle as an equal and equally active front in the ZUZ (and not just the OSUZ). This front was directed against the USSR diplomatic representatives in the ZUS (M. Lemyk's certificate as secretary and political head of the Soviet consulate in Lviv, Maylov's political process), against the Bolshevik agents, the Communist Party, and Sovietophilia. The purpose of these actions was to demonstrate the unity of the liberation front, the solidarity of Western Ukraine with the anti-Bolshevik struggle of the Central and Eastern Lands of Ukraine, and to eradicate communist and Sovietist agent work among the Ukrainian population in Western Ukraine.

r) Expropriation actions, which had been carried out against Polish state institutions long ago, were neglected in the hostilities, but the focus was on combat actions against the national and political oppression and police terror of the Polish authorities against Ukrainians.

This period of my activity ended with my imprisonment in June 1934. Previously, I had been arrested several times by the Polish police in connection with various actions of the UVO and OUN, for example, in late 1928 in Kalush and in Stanislaviv for organising November celebrations in Kalush to mark the 10th anniversary of 1 November and the creation of the ZUNR in 1918. In early 1932, I was detained while illegally crossing the Polish-Czech border and spent 3 months in a pre-trial prison that year in connection with an attack on the Polish commissar of Chekhov, . After my arrest in June 1934, I was investigated in prisons in Lviv, Krakow, and Warsaw until the end of 1935. At the end of that year and in early 1936, a trial took place before the District Court in Warsaw, in which I, along with 11 other defendants, was tried for belonging to the OUN and for organising an assassination attempt against Minister Bronisław Peracki of the Polish Interior (who was responsible for leading Poland's exterminationist policy against Ukrainians). In the Warsaw Trial, I was sentenced to death, which was commuted to life imprisonment on the basis of an amnesty law approved by the Polish Sejm during our trial. In the summer of 1936, the second major OUN trial took place in Lviv. I was tried as a regional leader of the OUN for the entire OUN-UPO activity of that period. There were more members of the Regional Executive Committee headed by me in the dock. My sentence in the Lviv trial was combined with the Warsaw trial - to life imprisonment. After that, I was imprisoned in the prisons of "Sventi Krzyż"

I spent five and a quarter years in the most severe prisons in Poland, most of it in strict isolation. During that time, I went on three hunger strikes of 9, 13 and 16 days, one of them together with other Ukrainian political prisoners, and two individually, in Lviv and Berest. I only learnt about the Organisation's preparations for my escape, which was the subject of a court case, when I was released.

The German-Polish war in September 1939 found me in Berestia on the Bug. From the first day of the war, the city was bombed by German aircraft. On 13 September, when the situation of Polish troops in that area became critical due to enemy air raids, the prison administration and guards hastily evacuated and I, along with other prisoners, including Ukrainian nationalists, was released. (I was freed by nationalist prisoners who somehow learned that I was being held in strict isolation.)

Together with a group of several dozen Ukrainian nationalists released from prison, I set off from Berestye southwest towards Lviv. We made our way along side roads, far from the main roads, trying to avoid encounters with both Polish and German troops. We benefited from the help of the Ukrainian population. In Volhynia and Galicia, from the Kovel region onwards, we got in touch with the existing OUN organisational network, which began to create partisan units, taking care of the protection of the Ukrainian population and procuring weapons and other ammunition for the upcoming struggle. In Sokal, I met with leading members of the OUN in that area. Some of them were at , others had returned from prison.

I discussed with them the situation and the direction of our work. It was a time when the collapse of Poland was already evident and it became known that the Bolsheviks were to occupy most of the ZUZ on the basis of an agreement with Hitler's Germany. Thus, the entire OUN activity in the Western Ukraine had to be quickly transferred to one anti-Bolshevik front and adjusted to the new conditions! From the Sokal region I went to Lviv in the company of a later member of the OUN Leadership Bureau, Dmytro Mayevsky-Taras. We arrived in Lviv a few days after the Bolshevik army and the occupation authorities had marched in.

I stayed in Lviv for two weeks. I lived in secret, but in view of the initial

Despite the lack of control of the Bolshevik police machine, he enjoyed considerable freedom of movement and came into contact not only with the leading assets of the OUN, but also with some of the leading figures in Ukrainian church and national church life. Together with the members of the Regional Executive and other leading members who were in Lviv at the time, we established the plans for the OUN's future activities on Ukrainian lands and its anti-Bolshevik struggle. The first priority was given to: the development of the OUN network and actions in all areas of Ukraine that were under Bolshevik control; the plan for a broad revolutionary struggle as the war spreads across Ukraine and regardless of the development of the war; and counteraction in the event of mass destruction of national assets in the ZOUZ by the Bolsheviks.

I immediately had a plan to stay in Ukraine and work in the direct revolutionary and liberation activities of the OUN. However, other members of the Organisation insisted that I go abroad under Bolshevik occupation and conduct organisational work there. This matter was finally interrupted by the arrival of a courier from the Leadership from abroad with the same demand. In the second half of October 1939, I left Lviv and, together with my brother Vasyl, who had returned to Lviv from the Polish concentration camp in Bereza Kartuzka, and 4 other members, crossed the Soviet-German demarcation line along the district roads; we arrived in Krakow partly on foot and partly by train. At that time, Krakow became the centre of Ukrainian political, cultural, educational, and social life on the western margins of the Ukrainian lands, not under Bolshevik but under German military occupation, and among the Ukrainian emigrant communities in Poland. In Krakow, I became involved in the work of the OUN branch there, which brought together many leading members from the penal colonies and Polish prisons; there were also several leading members who had long lived in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Austria. In November 1939, I went for two weeks to the town of Pishchany in Slovakia for treatment of rheumatism, along with two or three dozen Ukrainian political prisoners released from Polish prisons. Among them were many prominent leaders of the nationalist movement in the West Ukrainian lands. Several other leading members of the OUN, who had recently been active in organisational work in the West Ukrainian Lands, Transcarpathia and in exile, came to Pishchany. This made it possible to hold a series of meetings of the leading OUN activists in Pishchany, where they analysed the situation and the development of the liberation movement up to that time.

struggle, internal organisational affairs in the region and abroad. These meetings crystallised a number of cases that were important for the OUN's further struggle and needed to be resolved.

From Slovakia, I went to Vienna, where there was also an important OUN foreign station, which concentrated the OUN's ties with the West Ukrainian lands in the last years of the Polish occupation, as well as with Transcarpathian Ukraine. At the end of 1939, or in the first days of 1940, the leader of the OUN in the Ukrainian Lands, Tymchii-Lopatinsky, also came to Vienna. It was agreed that we would both go to Italy to meet with the then head of the Ukrainian Nationalist Leadership, Col. A. Melnyk. My trip to him was planned in Krakow. As a result of organisational meetings in Lviv, Krakow, Piszczany, and Vienna, I was to be the spokesperson for the leading OUN asset on the Ukrainian Railways, the asset released from prison, and the foreign asset that had emerged from the regional struggle of recent years and was in close contact with the region. I had to explain to the head of the Organisation's leadership a number of cases, projects and demands of an internal organisational and political nature in order to establish healthy relations between the OUN and the regional revolutionary activists. After the death of the founder and leader of the OUN, Polk. S. Konovalts, an abnormal relationship of tension and disagreement was created between the Regional Leadership and the OUN and PUN activists. The reason for this was, on the one hand, distrust of some individuals, the closest collaborators of reg. A. Melnyk's closest collaborators, in particular Yaroslav Baranovsky. This distrust grew on the basis of various facts of his work and organisational life. On the other hand, the wariness of the regional activists towards the policy of the foreign leadership was growing. In particular, after the so-called Treaty of Vienna in the case of Transcarpathian Ukraine, this turned into an opposition attitude to the orientation towards Hitler's Germany. The Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and the political agreement between Berlin and Moscow at the beginning of the war gave this difference a political edge. The arrival of the regional leader of the OUN brought the trip to the regiment to life. A. Melnyk. Tymchii-Lopatinsky and I were in agreement on all fundamental issues of the revolutionary liberation movement, which was eventually equally unanimous among the general population of the regional activists. A. Melnyk and eliminate the growing differences.

I was the first to go to Italy, in the first half of January 1940,

where the OUN station was headed by Professor S. Onatsky. There I met, among other things, my brother Oleksandr, who lived in Rome from 1933-34, studied there and received his doctorate in political and economic sciences, got married, and worked in our local village. With Col. A. Melnyk I met and talked with him in a city in northern Italy, first of all with the regional leader Tymchiy Lopatinsky.

These conversations ended in a negative outcome. Since the disagreements had previously been mainly with Melnyk's collaborators, they had to turn against him as well, given his position. Colonel Melnyk did not agree to remove J. Baranowski from his key position in the OUN, which gave him decisive influence and detailed insight into the most important affairs of the Organisation, including the affairs of the region and relations between the region and abroad. He also rejected our demand that the plan for the revolutionary and liberation struggle against the Bolsheviks should not be linked to Germany or dependent on German military plans. Tymchiy-Lopatinsky and I defended the position of the regional activists, that the OUN's struggle in Ukraine should be primarily related to the internal situation in the USSR, and especially in Ukraine, and that we had no allies to coordinate our plans with theirs. If the Bolsheviks were to launch a mass extermination or expulsion of national assets in the occupied Western lands in order to destroy the main base of the organised movement, then the OUN should launch a broad revolutionary guerrilla struggle, regardless of the international situation

(This is where Stepan Bandera's own biography breaks in. Information about the later years of his life and work for the Ukrainian liberation revolution is given in the article by Dr Hryhoriy Vaskovych "The Life and Work of Stepan Bandera" ("Ukrainian Correspondence", part 8 of 1 October 1964, Ukrainian Publishing House in Munich, pp. 3-7)).

Because Col. A. Melnyk did not want to give politically and personally, in February 1940, the OUN Revolutionary Leadership, headed by Stepan Bandera, was created. A year later, the Revolutionary Leadership convened the Second Great Assembly of the OUN, which

Stepan Bandera was unanimously elected head of the Leadership. Under his leadership, the OUN again became a vibrant revolutionary organisation. It builds an organisational network in the native lands, creates derivative groups of the OUN from the membership abroad, and, in agreement with German military circles committed to the Ukrainian cause, creates the Ukrainian Legion and organises the liberation struggle, together with other peoples enslaved by Moscow. Before the outbreak of the German-Russian war, Bandera initiated the creation of the Ukrainian National Committee to consolidate Ukrainian political forces for the struggle for statehood. The decision of the Leadership of the OUN on June 4, 1941, proclaimed the restoration of the Ukrainian state in Lviv, but because Hitler instructed his police to immediately eliminate this "conspiracy of Ukrainian independents", the Germans arrested Bandera.

Bandera within days of the act of proclaiming the restoration of the Ukrainian state. Stepan Bandera was a German prisoner until December 1944.

Then he and several other leading members of the OUN were released from prison in an attempt to ally the OUN and the UPA with Moscow. Stepan Bandera firmly rejected the German offer and did not cooperate.

At the Regional Broader Meeting of the OUN Leadership on the Ukrainian Railways in February 1945, which was interpreted as part of the Great Assembly of the OUN, a new Bureau of the Leadership was elected in the following composition: Bandera, Shukhevych, Stetsko. This choice was confirmed by the 1947 Conference of the OUN Central Committee, and Stepan Bandera became the Head of the OUN Leadership again. As the leader of the OUN, Stepan Bandera decided to continue the armed struggle against Moscow in the postwar period. He intensively organised the OUN's regional communications and combat groups, which kept in contact with the region until his death.

In 1948, the OUN's Foreign Parts formed an opposition to which Stepan Bandera opposed in terms of ideology, organisation and politics. In the same year, on his recommendation, representatives of the OUN ZC entered the National Council to consolidate the political activities of the Ukrainian emigration. Two years later, however, the OUN Central Committee decided to withdraw from the UNRada because it did not provide moral support for the revolutionary struggle and usurped the right to represent the Ukrainian people on behalf of fictitious parties. In order to resolve the conflict with the opposition of the UGVR, in April 1948 Bandera proposed that Lebed take over the leadership of the OUN Central Committee and

to form it with the participation of members of the opposition, which Lebed resisted in July, handing back the leadership to Bandera. In December 1950, in order to pacify further opposition criticism, Bandera resigned as the head of the OUN Central Committee, thus underlining the groundlessness of the accusations of his dictatorial ambitions and planning to move to Ukraine. In the meantime, he performed functions in the OUN Leadership 34 as a member of this Leadership, first under the chairmanship of Stefan Lenkavsky (Stefan Lenkavsky became the head of the OUN Central Committee on 3 December 1950), and later, from April 1951, under the chairmanship of Y. Stetsko. When the opposition stubbornly spread the news that the OUN in Ukraine had moved from nationalist to socialist positions and that the OUN Central Committee should do the same, Stefan Bandera decided to force the OUN-led Regional Committee to clearly define its ideological and political positions in order to prevent further speculation on "regional positions" and to sew neo-communism under the OUN brand. On 22 August 1952, he resigned from the post of Chairman of the OUN Leadership. This resignation was not, however, accepted by any competent OUN institution, and Bandera remained the OUN Leader until his death in 1959. The Fourth Conference of the OUN Central Committee in May 1953 elected Bandera again to the position of the OUN Central Committee Leader. In February 1954, it came to a break with the new opposition that had been growing in the OUN's Foreign Parts since 1953, after unsuccessful attempts to reach an agreement at the forum of the "Board of Commissioners", which "by the will of the Region" included L. Rebet, 3. Matla and St. Bandera. A year later, in 1955, the 5th Conference of the OUN Central Committee was held, which re-elected Stefan Bandera as the Head of the OUN Central Committee and since then has been intensifying the work of the Organisation. At that time, special attention was paid to the organisation of territories, regional relations and foreign policy.

15 October 1959. Stepan Bandera fell victim to a murder plot. A medical examination revealed that the cause of death was poison. Two years later, on 17 November 1961, the German judiciary proclaimed that the murderer of Stepan Bandera was Bohdan Stashynskyi, on the orders of Shelepin and Khrushchev. After a detailed investigation, the trial against Stashynsky's killer took place from 8 to 15 October 1962.

The verdict was announced on 19 October, in which Stashynsky was sentenced to 8 years in hard labour. The German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe affirmed that the main defendant in Bandera's murder was the Soviet government in Moscow.

## **The importance of the renal masses and their coverage**

*This article, the first in its series, by Stepan Bandera was published under the signature of C. Gray in the cyclostyle publication "Liberation Politics", part 1, year I, Prague, January 1946, pages 15-17. The author points out the importance and significance of the participation of broad circles of citizenship in domestic political action aimed at helping the revolutionary and liberation struggle, and gives a number of practical guidelines for carrying out this action.*

Our internal political work is aimed at literally reaching the entirety of citizenship, to reach every Ukrainian, both those involved and not involved in general public life, equally - within or outside of that life, and regardless of it.

The most important thing is to gain direct influence, to include the largest and most valuable part of them in our struggle. Therefore, we take the entire mass of the people as the object of our political work.

It is important to us for the following reasons: first, the mass is a collection of units. In order to influence the largest number of Ukrainians at the same time, we reach out to the entire mass. The most valuable units in terms of their ideology, courage and abilities live in it and grow out of it, while the relevant action will wake them up, give them an opportunity and open the way for them to express themselves. Many such highly valuable people live, so to speak, in the middle of the masses, but neither they nor anyone else knows about their abilities and valuable characteristics for political work. We need to go to the thickest masses, to the very bottom, to reach them, and we need an appropriate action to call them.

Secondly, we need to master the masses themselves, as a collective unit, with our ideas, struggles and corresponding actions. We need to involve it in political action. Because it gives a political movement and organisation a broad base. The masses, on the other hand, give the revolutionary struggle and every political action a great accelerating force and multiply its number.

In our struggle, the mass is an important factor, as a collection of units, and we join and unite it. And vice versa, we use the units to embrace and master the masses. We follow these two paths simultaneously, and one

work strengthens the other.

First of all, we have to know in detail each environment among which we intend to conduct political work. It is not enough to know the general nature and characteristics of the elements that come together in it, or the general psychology of the masses. It is necessary to study each specific environment, in particular, to learn its special characteristics. Obviously, all this has to be done during the course of the activity itself, because we cannot afford long introductory observations and research before starting work in the present circumstances.

To know the environment means to know its average type, its individual manifestations, deviations from the average, and various peculiarities. It is necessary to know and understand people, the way they think, perceive and react to certain phenomena, to know how they live, how they experience things, how they relate to various phenomena. First of all, it is necessary to inquire about their material status, living, working and living conditions, opportunities to arrange and improve their lives, their conditions, needs and desires.

To do this, our members need to enter the life of the masses, all its manifestations. They need to look for different meetings with people and take an interest in as many of their affairs as possible.

In order to be able to conduct successful work to educate the masses, one must accept them as they really are, which means also with all their faults and . When approaching the masses, one should not rely only on high-cost or already produced elements and only deal with them, and give up on the rest. In all actions aimed at the broader masses, the ultimate goal is to adapt your tactics and approach to the level of the average citizen, to his or her interests, way of thinking, and his or her ability and willingness to follow the path of political struggle and meet the demands it makes.

Therefore, the tactics of political work among the masses must be simple and in every respect adapted to the political level of the environment. Life itself imposes such requirements, and without this, political work aimed at the masses is unsuccessful, especially at first.

If we shifted all our work to mass production, then we would have

The result would be a decrease in its level. But we have no intention of doing so. Just as we have done so far, we need to continue all the types and forms of our activities that are designed for the best, most advanced elements.

The work of activating, attracting, gathering, cultivating and refuelling the best advanced units from the masses must be further strengthened and there is no question of neglecting or stopping it.

It's about expanding our activities, not about putting them on a different track. We have to activate and consolidate political work intended for the masses, without weakening the work intended the advanced, leading elements. We conduct our internal political work in several ways simultaneously. The higher the demands we place on the environment, the higher the political level of this work, and at the same time the narrower its framework and the narrower the circles it covers. On the contrary, the wider the circles covered by a political action and the lower the level of its participants, the simpler the nature of this political work.

When we adapt mass political work to the nature and level of the masses, we do so only for tactical reasons First of all

— The content always remains unchanged, only the external forms and practical arrangement of the work change. But even in this respect, we don't think about constantly adapting to the level of the masses. As soon as we get the ground under our feet in a certain environment, we immediately begin to shape these masses, pulling them up to a higher level and, step by step, leading them towards the goal. Having an influence on the masses, we begin to control them, and from the state of the masses, to which we initially had to adapt our tactics, we transfer them to the role of a conscious, developed and active factor in our political struggle.

At first glance, it may seem that, given the lack of people in this area, we will not be able to do this among the frontline elements, that is, that we will be forced to take on one or the other job. But in reality, this does not have to be the case.

Work on a large-scale, massive scale, development of appropriate working methods, creation of the necessary organisational apparatus, finding the right ways and providing the necessary accelerating force

— All of this requires an initially large investment of energy and a significant number of people to commit to the work. But to continue and

further deepening of labour, it is not necessary to add new forces, not even to leave those employed at the beginning. For in a short time, the initial contribution of forces will be paid for by the influx of new forces awakened to activity.

As a result of active work among the masses, we will have many new people at our disposal, and they will be able to be entrusted with less complex political tasks and to take away from people with greater political sophistication, who are very much needed today for more responsible political action. The work among the masses will be largely carried on by those new people who will be identified and come to us.

As we activate the masses and gain influence among them, we will have a stronger and more stable position in many areas of public life. Because the content of our work among the masses is no different from the content of our political work, which we have been doing among narrower circles, we only have to choose the appropriate form for it. The main task is to keep the content consistent, while the popularisation of the finished product is not difficult and does not require much work.

At the present moment, we have so much political capital that mass political work will not diminish it, but rather increase it. Let us further remember that our struggle against Nazi Germany is now of great importance, and will lose it over time. If we do not use it now, we will squander the hard-won political capital to a large extent.

So, if we do not reach the masses, they will partly not go with us, or even partly against us, and will be largely demoralised. And we need the masses in our political struggle, including the emigrant masses.

## **On the problem of political consolidation**

*This article by Stepan Bandera, signed by C. A. Siryi, was published in monthly magazine Liberation Politics (London, Yearbook I, pp. 4-5, June-July 1946). One year after the Second World War, when the attention of the Ukrainian emigration was drawn to foreign policy events and affairs, or to the fate of the "diaspora" in the refugee camps, the author of the article called for the political unification of all Ukrainian creative forces in foreign lands, adding that they were an important factor in helping the warring homeland. According to Stepan Bandera, uniting all these forces, consolidating them into one whole, without sacrificing their individual specificity, was the most important task. This problem occupied him since 1945. Therefore, he returned to the issue of political consolidation in his articles and letters over the years. (See: "A Word to the Ukrainian Nationalist Revolutionaries Abroad" from 1948, "For a Complete Political Structure" from 1958, "Interview for the W. Sharwan Radio Station in Buffalo, USA" in 1959, and also letters to Fenk from 15. 12. 1945, to Kres from 16. 8. 1947 and to Nastas from 11.1.1948). In addition, excerpts of the article "On the Problem of Political Consolidation" were published in the "Messages of the Leadership", part 2, August 1946.*

*In his articles on the consolidation of the Ukrainian state, St. Bandera constantly set the unchanging premise that "political groups should be guided by one basic political imperative of competition for the realisation of the main goal: An independent, united Ukrainian state, and to subordinate all their narrower, party interests to this goal," and that they should pursue this goal in one way - through the path of national liberation revolution*

The desire to consolidate the whole of Ukrainian political life in exile, especially that which is bubbling up among the general public, has its deepest source in a healthy sense of the great need for our existence and liberation politics. However, in the practical political plans and measures coming from various party branches, there is a predominance of narrow party goals and tendencies, with which these branches try to direct the healthy gin of the masses to consolidate into the mainstream of party politics and direct it to their party trays. All those who are passionate about the idea of consolidation, without narrow party calculations, strive to gather and unite all forces, opposing

The Ukrainian emigrant community is not only concerned about the dispersion of political energy, but also seeks to further unify and coordinate activities in all areas, especially political action. However, achieving these desired effects is not as easy as it seems at first glance.

A mechanical consolidation, which is what most of its spokespersons usually think of, would probably not bring any significant positive results. On the contrary, if we were to link different political groups only formally, and they continued to pursue their own political paths, not only in minor issues but also in fundamental matters of Ukrainian domestic and foreign policy, the result would be weakening instead of strengthening, and mutual paralysis instead of unification. Mechanical unification, without genuine coordination of the most important matters of our liberation policy, without one common political platform that would determine one path to one common goal, would not only fail to bind the whole of Ukrainian political energy on the path to liberation, but would also slow down the action of the constituent parts of our political reality and prevent the achievement of their positive work. The image of such a political unity of the Ukrainian emigrant population and the political forces within it would be an optical illusion, and would appear to be real only if observed from a very superficial point of view.

In addition, the weak external activity of a mechanical consolidation entity, caused by significant internal differences, would have a foreign policy effect equal to the impotence of the entire Ukrainian force in exile.

An essential feature of all plans for mechanical consolidation is the attempt to create a prefabricated structure-conglomerate of various, if possible all, political groups, without taking into account the process of fundamental internal political consolidation, as a result of which all groups participating in the union would adopt one common political platform, a common line and common principles of liberation politics. These moments of internal consolidation are not excluded in such projects, but they are practically in the , i.e. they have to be the result of a preliminary, mechanical combination.

There are also thoughts of mechanical consolidation among that part of the emigrant population that does not understand the essence of our

political issues, strives for unity and unanimous political action, and wants to see the same internal essence in external manifestations. It is often thought that all that is needed is for different political groups to create a common political body, and the rest will come later. But such simplistic, superficial methods do not lead to a specific goal; on the contrary, they can only hinder and complicate the process of natural consolidation. If we start with the creation of a mechanical model, and only then tackle the main, significant problems and difficulties, then unsuccessful measures and attempts would only undermine the ground for other consolidation efforts built on sound foundations. Unsuccessful measures and lifeless creations would absorb the energy of political centres and forces in vain, create a state of mutual paralysis and inactivity, waste energy on endless "tug-of-war", stagnation and inability to be active outwardly.

Before answering the question of what kind of consolidation is possible and necessary in our country, it is advisable to clarify a positive understanding of this problem.

We mean the creation of such a system and relationships of Ukrainian political directions, forces, trends and actions that all of them, while retaining their positive specificities, individual goals and characteristics, delaying their own development path, would strive primarily for the realisation of one, common national goal, pursue it in the most general sense - one common path in the cardinal issues of national existence, recognise one hierarchy of main values, the same criteria for assessing the main issues of national policy, respect and implement one main principle of the internal national order of affairs and recognise the authority of one, supreme governing factor and representation of Ukraine.

Within such a framework, there must be room for processes of internal differentiation, crystallisation and growth of individual movements, movements and groups, the possibility for constant development in the structure and relations between these factors, and natural conditions for healthy rivalry and competition for influence.

So, on the one hand, we do not recognise the tendencies of the mechanical, the very

On the one hand, we do not want to see only an external binding of different groups, which would then go down completely different cross roads, and on the other hand, we do not want to see such concepts that would lead to political consolidation on the path of inhibiting the natural progress and development of political thought and action (through petrification of the existing system and balance of power) and which (tendencies) would create a rigid structure of internal Ukrainian life that would make it impossible for individual movements, political directions and forces to develop freely and healthily.

In the question of whether there are important, in particular objective, preconditions for the process of consolidation of Ukrainian political groups in foreign lands, two points are of primary importance: first, whether the Ukrainian political factors in question have one common goal, and second, whether in the current general political situation, this goal can be achieved through several paths or only one path.

Ukrainian national political factors and groups can only be classified as those that stand on the platform of state independence and unity of Ukraine, i.e., recognise the liberation of Ukraine from Moscow-Bolshevik enslavement and the restoration of a sovereign Ukrainian state as the main and most important goal of Ukrainian politics and all the struggles of the Ukrainian people. This is a basic prerequisite for any grouping to be taken into account in political consolidation and, in general, to be recognised as a Ukrainian political factor in any way.

Most Ukrainian political groups in exile declaratively stand on this national political platform. It is another matter whether and to what extent individual groups confirm this declarative position through their practical political work. But we will not consider this issue. We need to take into account every such political factor that has not taken opposite positions in living political practice, but which has reliable elements that, if included in the broad structure of political forces with the right political path, will give it a healthy national creative content. All factors with such potential should be given space and opportunity to enter the consolidation structure.

The first and foremost prerequisite for participation in political consolidation is that political groups should be guided by one basic political imperative of competition for the realisation of a major goal:

The party members subordinated all their narrower, party interests to the creation of an independent Ukrainian state.

The second prerequisite for full political consolidation is the recognition of only one way to achieve that common goal. For even if the first prerequisite were perfectly met, consolidation of the lively political work of all the groups would be very difficult if there were more than one path to liberation and state independence in a given political situation. If, in addition to one possible independence policy, there was room for a second or more, which also had a chance of success, it is obvious that some groups would follow one road, while others would choose other paths, according to their general political orientation. Such a situation would create an unsuitable ground for full consolidation, if understood not only as recognition of common highest values and pursuit of the same goal, but also as unification, unanimity of practical political activity in the most important matters so that there would be one Ukrainian independent policy.

How many possible paths a nation's politics can take depends on various factors, primarily on the overall situation. This is a complex issue that cannot be solved in a formulaic way.

The basic rule, tested and confirmed by the historical experience of nations, states that even when more paths open up for the policy of a nation as a whole, it should not be divided, but should maintain its unanimity in the most important matters.

But there are extraordinary situations in the life of nations when this principle cannot be preserved and, under the pressure of life's finitude, the struggle for the foundations of their own existence and development goes on different paths at the same time. Sometimes there is a situation when, in matters fundamental to the existence of a nation, there is no absolute, unquestionable certainty that the whole nation has only one way out. In such moments, the automaticity of political differentiation is at work. It does not always lead to a practical division of fronts. Sometimes this process does not find practical manifestation and does not go beyond the realm of contemplation and sentiment.

But in emergency situations, when it comes to the basic, radical life issues of the people, in their fate is decided, and the chances, as well as the risks, diverge along two or more roads - political

The instinct of the people directs the living national policy simultaneously on different, often opposite paths to ensure that the greatest risk, i.e. putting the fate of the people on the line, is avoided. Although this creates a difficult and unfortunate internal state and a difficult external situation for the people, it is sometimes the ultimate and ultimately salutary manifestation of a nation's political maturity. Often, there is not even a planned distribution of roles, but a kind of automaticity, so that different political forces follow different paths that suit them.

During the last World War, this process of dividing fronts was manifested among many European nations in critical situations. Observations of these phenomena convince us that in some cases it was beneficial for those nations, and in others it was harmful. It is difficult to establish an absolute basis for assessing the processes of splitting the practical and political activities of a nation into two or more paths. The general rule is that these processes are negative, because they disperse the strength and energy of the nation at a time when they need to be concentrated. Because of this division, the nation often loses at all bets, whereas if it had concentrated all its potential on one of the possible paths, it would have achieved its goal.

However, there are exceptional situations in which a nation's policy towards external forces and international constellations and processes must follow simultaneously different, ramified, and often opposing paths. When the situation requires the division of roles and attitudes by more than one stake, then the order of the day is not to unify the policy, but to differentiate it.

This situation occurs mostly among nations fighting for their sovereignty. Sometimes, to consolidate the foreign policy effect of the actions of one political direction, it is necessary to have other directions playing together. It happens that a political action along one line produces a positive effect in another direction, which can be used and turned to the benefit of the whole only by another political factor that pursues the corresponding political line.

In such historical moments, when the fate of the nation is being decided in a competition, one must proceed from the main question of what is the possible and most appropriate current policy and what internal political system best meets the requirements of the moment. That is why political consolidation be an end in itself, but a means, a political tool.

For the development and growth of the power of the people, the process of consolidation of heterogeneous political elements can itself have positive and negative, inhibiting effects. But in such circumstances, when it comes to defending the very foundations of the nation's life and development, all internal political processes must be subordinated to the requirements and needs of that struggle for existence. Also, the development and structure of the people's forces should be exactly what is best suited to withstand that historical moment. Therefore, the aspect of the struggle against an external attack is dominant in this matter.

Or is there more than one open path for Ukrainian independence politics in the current situation?

Only one and only one! This is the path of uncompromising revolutionary struggle against Bolshevik-Moscow imperialism, and all the independent forces of Ukraine have taken this path. That this path is the only one - is the best evidence of the fact that there is no other independent liberation concept or action.

This applies not only to the Krayina (a popular designation among UVO and OUN members of Ukrainian lands, mainly western ones, to distinguish them from the foreign lands where the Organisation's leadership was located). It is impossible to separate political actions abroad from political reality in Ukraine. Because any emigrant political concept without a support and counterpart in the native land is a branch that is cut off from the stump. But also among purely emigrant political groups, after the complete bankruptcy of one orientation policy after another, the conviction has matured that in Ukraine's current situation the only possible and correct concept is the revolutionary liberation concept of an uncompromising struggle against Bolshevism, which relies on Ukraine's own forces and the joint struggle of other nations fighting for their lives against the same enemy in a similar situation, and which considers external forces and changing international constellations to be additional or auxiliary factors.

No political grouping in exile is now formulating or implementing any other valid liberation concept. To be more precise, it should be said that the majority of political groups in exile do not pursue any viable political concept. The inherent content of their existence is a sporadic response to certain events and mostly

The current policy is based on programmatic and declarative theorising that is far from reality. And in the field of current politics, there is only one independent revolutionary liberation concept.

Thus, there is quite realistically a second main prerequisite for the consolidation of Ukrainian political factors, also abroad. Not only are there no objective obstacles, but on the contrary, the current political situation, the recent vicissitudes of Ukrainian political action and current political rationale simply suggest, as a matter of course, that all Ukrainian political factors and forces should unanimously follow the same path to liberation, unity and state sovereignty of Ukraine.

When considering the issue of consolidating Ukrainian political forces and actions, one must take into account the current state of Ukrainian political life and the structure of political forces in the region and in exile. This should be the basis for creating the desired Ukrainian political reality and the corresponding formation of the integrity of Ukrainian political forces. The positive aspects of this state of affairs should be accepted as the basis for the planned system, and the negative aspects should be reconsidered as areas that need to be corrected or rebuilt.

In Ukraine, the struggle between the two irreconcilable worlds is ongoing without end. The unanimous front of the Ukrainian revolutionary independent liberation movement stands against Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism and totalitarianism, against Bolshevik enslavement, violence and the entire system of the Bolshevik regime. In the struggle against Bolshevism, there is a single monolithic Ukrainian independent force. In the tough conditions of the Bolshevik regime, there is no room for half-hearted positions, for weak, ready-made political entities. There is no room for languishing. There is no room for reckless struggle or surrender. In such circumstances, all political groups looking for opportunities for compromise, that is, opportunities to exist and act in the middle ground between the struggle fronts, have withdrawn from the field of active action into oblivion. In Ukraine, there is only one liberation concept, the concept of the Ukrainian revolutionary nationalist movement, one political action - the revolutionary struggle, one active political force - the revolutionary OUN, and one military force - the revolutionary UPA.

The liberation and revolutionary struggle of the OUN and UPA became the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people, in which all active independent elements joined, regardless of their party and political affiliation. The initiator, the engine, the leading and the main force in the revolutionary liberation struggle in Ukraine is still the revolutionary OUN. Such a spread of the struggle, covering all the independent elements of the whole of Ukraine, found an appropriate political and structural form in the creation of a national political formation of a revolutionary state type.

The UPA emerged on the initiative of the OUN as a nationwide revolutionary army, in which all those who want to fight for the liberation of Ukraine from Bolshevik Moscow and for an independent, united Ukrainian state are fighting. The UPA has no party principles or party policy. As a consequence of the entire historical development of the liberation struggle during the last war, in particular as a result of the fact that the revolutionary struggle of the independent forces in Ukraine enveloped the entire nation and all areas of life, a whole underground system of independent state life was formed, which exists and operates independently and against the occupying, first Hitler's and then Bolshevik state system. This formation combines elements of state organisation with elements of the underground system of organising social life and political action. As the process of creating Ukrainian underground state life and a revolutionary state formation was completed, the Ukrainian Main Liberation Council was created - a revolutionary, supreme state body of Ukraine.

In Ukraine, two state formations are opposed to each other. The first, the so-called Ukrainian SSR, is an exposition of Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism and its instrument for the enslavement and exploitation of Ukraine, which is held together only by reckless terror. It does not guard the good of Ukraine, does not protect the vital rights of the Ukrainian people, but is at the service of the alien Moscow imperialist centre and the Bolshevik Party. The Ukrainian SSR did not originate from the will of Ukraine; on the contrary, it was an opposition to it and a political entity for its subjugation.

Against this alien, disenfranchised, forcibly imposed formation, the so-called Ukrainian SSR, stands an independent Ukrainian state formation, with the UHHR as its supreme authority. As a revolutionary, state formation, it

is fighting against the Bolshevik system, exists and operates in Ukraine through the use of appropriate underground methods, against the Bolshevik invasion. Although it does not fully exercise sovereign rights and all state functions in Ukraine, although the Bolshevik system and regime have not yet been eliminated from Ukraine, it is, not the Ukrainian SSR, that is the embodiment of Ukrainian statehood, a Ukrainian state entity that carries out the will of Ukraine, protects its rights and represents it to the outside world.

The UHHRU, as the revolutionary supreme body of Ukraine, although it does not perform all the functions of a normal state government, performs the most important and essential role of the supreme state body of a nation that is in a struggle for its existence, namely, it leads this struggle. Although it does not have all the formal and visible attributes that outwardly mark state bodies and their functions, fact that the UHHRU's state action is recognised and obeyed by the Ukrainian people is all the more valuable and important.

This is an unprecedented manifestation of the highest moral and political authority of the national state body, especially because it does not use the means of normal state executions and coercion, but, on the contrary, is persecuted by the most reckless methods and means of the totalitarian-terrorist occupation system. The broad masses of the people follow him, carry out his orders and instructions, despite the fact that by doing so they are exposed to the most brutal persecution and extermination by the Bolsheviks, but do not retreat from him even in the face of death.

In those conditions, more than in the conditions of normal state life, the truth and rightness of the Ukrainian independent state formation with the revolutionary, supreme state body - the UHHR at its head, its moral and political authority, position and significance are revealed and constantly confirmed. The Ukrainian people, not through elections and voting, *but* through their sacrificial, incessant struggle, are documenting their unbreakable will to live independently and confirming the mandate that they, as the sole sovereign of Ukraine, give to the Ukrainian Main Liberation Council, which leads and represents independent Ukrainian statehood.

In Ukraine, therefore, the process of political consolidation of all

independent national elements on the UHHRU platform. How did this consolidation take shape and how was it carried out? In contrast to the Bolshevik regime and its system, there is only one independent camp. The unifying factor is the common liberation struggle, in which all those who are against Bolshevism and for an independent Ukrainian state take direct or indirect part, or at least solidarise with it and sympathise with it. Volunteer revolutionaries are fighting in the UPA, regardless of their party orientation. And the UHHR has prominent figures, leaders and activists from different political environments.

As an organised political force, only one revolutionary OUN remained on the field of struggle in Ukraine. It must be stated that there is no other independent political organisation or group in Ukraine today that manifests its existence through visible political activity. We will not analyse this fact in detail here, but note that the reason is, on the one hand, the very difficult Bolshevik conditions, and on the other hand, the weakness of all other political ideas and groups. And as a result, either the adherents of other political trends are unable to undertake their own political action in the sub-Bolshevik conditions, or the ideas and the entire political content of other political trends cannot capture the element that is ready to fight in those conditions.

However, numerous elements of other political movements joined and actively participated in the liberation struggle, which was initiated and organised by the revolutionary OUN, not as political groups, but individually, as units that want to fight for the freedom of Ukraine and join the existing, tried and tested revolutionary ranks. For all these patriotic fighters, narrow party affairs are in the further distance, and the most important thing is the current struggle.

Appreciating and honouring such a highly patriotic attitude of the independents of other party trends, and to facilitate the adherents of other party programmes to take part in the revolutionary liberation struggle,

- The OUN gave rise to the creation of a nationwide revolutionary armed force - the UPA, and later, with the spread of the revolutionary struggle to the size of a nationwide revolutionary movement, the UPA led to the creation of the UGVR.

Although, apart from the OUN, no other political independent organisation exists or is active in Ukraine, the UHHRU in its concept, structure and personnel is not a one-party body, but as a state formation and as a state body, it is based on the principle of non-partisanship. The UHHRU represents different political directions, as there are figures from different political environments.

The initiative came from the UPA. According to the political and ideological understanding of the OUN, the mono-party system in state life and in the state formation does not meet the needs of full and healthy national development. In the state organisation of the people, there must be room for political differentiation, crystallisation and free development of political groups and for healthy, creative competition between them. In performing their functions, the state bodies themselves must take a non-partisan stance: first of all, they must care about the good of the whole, and then fairly protect the interests of all positive constituent parts.

The current situation in Ukraine, where a foreign hostile force is stifling and paralysing the free development of political life, is abnormal. We are fighting for full political freedom in a free Ukraine, and in a sovereign Ukrainian state, the possibility for the existence and development of political groups must be guaranteed. The process of organising and activating political groups would not contradict the concept and state formation led by the UHHRU, and could take place within its framework from time to time. If there were other political organisations or groups in Ukraine today that were truly committed to the liberation struggle and state independence of Ukraine, they would have found their place within the UHHRU.

So in Ukraine, in the midst of the greatest intensity of the liberation revolutionary struggle, two very important historical processes were completed simultaneously: an independent revolutionary underground formation of Ukraine was created and the political consolidation of all independent, active elements of the Ukrainian people was carried out. This consolidation was born out of the organic order of historical development. It is and well because it emerged in the name of an immortal, great, common idea and was realised on a state platform - within the framework of a state formation.

We need to be clear and unequivocally state that the creation of an underground state formation and the activities of a revolutionary state government in Ukraine under Bolshevik conditions is such a high moral, political, revolutionary and organisational achievement that we do not find in the history of other nations in the modern, eventful era. Similar political phenomena in other nations, although much weaker and not created in such difficult circumstances and with external assistance, are recognised in the world as the highest achievements in the struggle for independence. To misunderstand and underestimate one's own achievements, which are bought with such high sacrifices on a daily basis, is a manifestation of moral degeneration and political blindness, underestimation of the worth and capability of one's people. And it is an unforgivable national crime to diminish or devalue the achievements of the liberation struggle in the eyes of a foreign world.

Now let's look at the situation in exile. Here, Ukrainian political life and the structure of political forces are much different than in their native lands. Thanks to freedom, numerous political groups and organisations exist here. There is no direct struggle against the enemy, and political life is largely filled with empty party politics, petty inter-party squabbles and disputes, and programmatic theorising that is detached from life and actual reality.

Under different conditions and in a different situation than in the region, the process of political consolidation in exile must take place differently and find appropriate forms. When considering the question of which of the consolidation concepts in exile is the most correct, we must first establish which point is crucial in this matter.

Our position is that in the current situation of Ukraine, in all matters of Ukrainian politics, in general and in individual parts, the most important aspect is the aspect of the liberation struggle itself, and the decisive criterion is its demands and needs. Everything that helps, facilitates and strengthens this struggle, everything that makes its success and effect a line of liberation - all this is good and positive.

Similarly, the consolidation process of Ukrainian political forces and actions in exile should be subject to this general rule. Consolidation has the task of contributing to the liberation action of

to include, if possible, all political forces in order to coordinate their actions and to make it positive for the cause of liberation, to create such an internal Ukrainian political constellation and structure that will ensure the maximum concentration of Ukrainian forces in the direct struggle, that is, in the actions related to that struggle, will create a unanimous internally cohesive formation of all independent forces that will monolithically and coordinatedly oppose the enemy and always speak with one voice and unanimity to the entire outside world. All of these main goals of consolidation are active in exile. Even though there is no direct struggle against the enemy, as in the homeland, all political work must be directed as a supportive action for the local struggle.

The political forces in the emigration must conduct coordinated foreign policy activities in order to assist and support the liberation struggle in Ukraine as much as possible, to achieve the best possible foreign policy effect of the regional struggle, and to demonstrate and confirm to the world the fact that all national independence forces of Ukraine, both in the region and in the emigration, constitute a single front and a single political formation in the struggle against Moscow Bolshevism for Ukraine's state independence.

In short: consolidation must bring internal cohesion to the Ukrainian liberation front, strengthen its external position and increase the foreign policy success of the revolutionary liberation struggle. Both of these points, internal and external, contain all the most important goals of the consolidation plans.

From this definition of the objectives, it is already clear concept and consolidation posture will have the best effect.

The first and most important thing is to coordinate the political life and actions of the emigration with the liberation struggle in the land. To unify the whole of Ukrainian independence politics so that there is only one line of it, and that all political action in the emigration of all its factors is linked to the liberation struggle in Ukraine. To unite the entire emigration, all political factors, and link it to the liberation movement in the native lands in a single national state formation, in which all independence elements - political groups, organisations and other factors - would find their place, so that the entire Ukrainian independence world would create a unanimous state-type integrity.

This solution is provided by the concept of consolidation on the state platform, within the framework of an independent, functioning state formation, with the principle of political primacy of the liberation struggle in Ukraine - consolidation on the platform and within the UHHRU.

The Ukrainian independent state formation, led by the UGV-Rada, which encompasses and unites all independent elements in the region, provides the best platform and organisational forms for the same unification and coverage of the entire emigration, all its independent elements. Due to the fact that it is not a party or inter-party body, but a state formation, all the elements and factors that make up the whole of the Ukrainian national emigration can find their proper place in it. Thus, political organisations and groups, various political factors representing the Ukrainian state tradition, which at one time received a mandate from the people as heads and members of the governments of the Ukrainian state, or as parliamentary representatives of the Ukrainian people or parts of it; representations of central public institutions, class (professional) organisations, Ukrainian churches, the scientific world, and, in general, the entire national emigration.

All of these factors, having become part of one general state formation of the UHHR, in its foreign part, will actively participate in the statehood struggle, based mainly on the regional liberation struggle. They will be politically connected with it and will contribute to strengthening and consolidating its foreign policy successes and thus make a positive contribution to the liberation cause. As a result, they are gaining and securing (now and the future) a place in the structure of Ukrainian state-creating elements. At the same time, all these factors, coordinating their activities in the unanimous line of the state's liberation policy, retain their separateness and realise their specific narrower goals.

If this concept of consolidation is implemented, the entire life of Ukrainian emigration will eventually have an internal structure similar to that of nations living in a state. The relevant foreign bodies of the UHHR will perform the functions of the highest, governing state factor, albeit without all the means of normal state executions and sanctions, but using the means of political and moral categories, such as the authority of a universally recognised

state factor, internal solidarity and self-discipline.

The current attitude of some factors in exile who have a negative or indifferent attitude to the liberation struggle in Ukraine, including the UHHR, for narrowly party motives cannot have a significant decisive impact on the state and development of events in their native lands, nor on the foreign policy position of our cause, which is represented by the UHHR. However, is important to note that these factors show their solidarity and thus contribute to the success of the case, or conduct an unfriendly and harmful campaign, even if it is only informative. Even if their action against the UHHRU had no immediate consequences, the very fact that it is Ukrainian undermines moral positions, and this casts a shadow on the integrity of the whole. However, a unanimous stand on the fundamental issues of Ukrainian liberation, demonstrated before the whole nation and before the outside world, and with a healthy internal political differentiation, will certainly and significantly lead to the internal consolidation of the liberation front and to the strengthening of the foreign policy position of the Ukrainian cause.

The question of why such consolidation on the basis of the state, and not on the basis of inter-party understanding alone, is largely covered by the previous discussion. First and foremost, the demands of liberation politics and struggle are decisive.

The state formation of the UHHR provides the best platform and organisational framework for the unification of all independent political factors in the emigration. It sets, first and foremost, important, non-partisan state political tasks around which all forces of Ukrainian emigration, including all political groups, will unite in a joint political action. The statehood platform and such an organisational framework will best help to resolve all inter-party problems, and a joint lively action will best unite all positive forces.

If the consolidation is on a state basis, then why exactly on the UHHRU platform, and not, for example, on the UPR platform? These will be, among other things, the opposition's voices against this plan.

We are answering this question right away. We are not trying to give an exhaustive answer, and in particular, there is no need to analyse the state and legal positions of the factors in the UPR camp. Because the purpose of all these considerations

- to put forward such positive aspects that lead to political reconciliation and unity, rather than exacerbate controversial and divisive issues. So, we will operate with real political facts and touch only on what is essential to the coverage of the issue at hand, which cannot be avoided here.

First of all, the UPR as a political factor can only act as an emigration factor. The history of its activities, in particular those of the last two decades, has so clearly confirmed and documented this political fact for both the Ukrainian and foreign political worlds that there is no need to prove it, and it is impossible to seriously deny it. Putting forward the thesis of the current so-called UPR government as the bearer and representative of the Ukrainian state, one could only appeal to the past, to the history of Ukrainian statehood since 1918-20, and support the idea that it retained the mandate and competence of the legitimate government of Ukraine in exile.

If the revolutionary state life and the process of the growth of a revolutionary state formation out of the living reality, a process that culminated in the creation of the UHHR, had not taken place in our liberation struggle and in the political development of Ukraine since the beginning of the last world war, then our independence policy would probably have to refer to the past and, in contrast to the Moscow-Bolshevik attitude of the so-called government of the Ukrainian SSR, put forward a traditional, emigrant government as a representative of Ukrainian statehood. It is another matter whether this role should have been played by the UPR government or, for example, by the UDP 1941 onwards. But we will not consider this issue here, because such a need is not relevant.

However, the underground state formation and revolutionary supreme state body of Ukraine, the UHHR, which exists and operates in Ukraine as a political fact and factor, has a huge advantage over the emigration or traditional governments, both for the revolutionary struggle itself and for the international position of the Ukrainian cause. It would be unnecessary to argue this point more extensively here.

Those who are not convinced of the importance and necessity of developing liberation politics and revolutionary struggle in Ukraine itself should consider the importance and significance of the following in contemporary world politics

have similar factors of other nations, and how these factors are evaluated in the policies of foreign countries. We have seen this at the end of the war and after it, with various emigrant governments that provided their allies with significant services during the war and gained significant positions, - have been met by the same allies with numerous acts that undermine or eliminate their importance and role. Instead, the policies of their allies, the great powers, are trying to gain influence and position in relation to the political processes and forces that exist and operate in the homeland of those emigrant governments at the cost of their fall (or decline). The reason for this attitude of the Western powers to the emigration and marginal factors of the enslaved peoples is, in addition to the motives of political tactics against the USSR, the consistent and cold realism of their policy towards these peoples. In the expectation that the enslaved peoples concerned should play a real role in international events as power factors, not just propaganda factors, the policy of the great powers looks first and foremost at what is happening in those countries, at the that are taking place there, and at the forces and factors that shape the local reality. Today, even weak, problematic relations with tangential regional factors are more important to them than the support of their loyal allies, the emigrant governments. From the political point of view, this is neither disloyalty to allies nor ingratitude, but simply sober political realism, which considers the people as a whole, i.e. its main part, acting on its own territory, and not an emigrant fragment, to be the subject of political action.

Such "international political demonstration lectures" should study those Ukrainian emigrant political factors, in particular those that have strayed far from the ground of political truth (i.e., the truth that a people in the liberation struggle must be guided primarily by the rationale and needs of this struggle) and rely too much on salvation from the outside world, and, looking at foreign political objects, that the people in the struggle for liberation must be guided primarily by the rationale and needs of this struggle) and rely too much on salvation from the outside world, and, looking into other people's political horizons, use other people's criteria and measures developed for other, different political situations to assess our political problems. Using the many examples provided by current world events, one can easily see that in other people's sober, "high class" politics, political issues like ours are evaluated by the same criteria and measures that our "homegrown" revolutionary movement uses. Perhaps that is why it will be easier to find common ground

political language.

Observing the positions (on the one hand, of the regional and, on the other hand, of the emigrant political factors of other nations, their attitudes towards one and other Western great powers) and the whole evolution of these relations in recent years, it becomes easier to understand how great a political significance the existence and activities of an underground state formation and a similarly revolutionary government in Ukraine have. Its contrast with the Bolshevik exposition has much stronger attributes and more persuasive power on the international stage than the exposition of the emigrant government. The very fact that it exists and operates on Ukrainian territory and that the Bolsheviks cannot destroy it, despite the efforts of the totalitarian NKVD state machine, is such a strong and clear evidence of its roots in the people and its strength that no enemy propaganda can do anything against this evidence.

But every emigrant government, even one that has all the attributes of legitimacy and military strength, but at the same time the fact that it is an emigrant government, that its seat is in a foreign land, not in its native land, cannot be of such importance. As for the "UPR government," no one could argue that its weakest point is that it is in exile.

If the political environment of the UPR wants to defend the thesis of the UPR government as the government of Ukraine, then it must be argued that it did not fully manifest itself in this role in recent years, which were so important and so rich in far-reaching events in the history of the liberation struggle. It is difficult to understand how such claims can be made, knowing that the claimant to the position of the government of Ukraine has not only failed to lead the recent liberation struggle, but has not even responded to events in Ukraine in the sense that one would expect from a bearer and representative of Ukraine's state independence. In such a role, the inherent content of the "action" of that "government" would be inactivity.

Here it should be emphasised once again that we do not want to polemicise, analyse or highlight the position and role of the UPR at this point. If this were necessary, then we would have to critically analyse, first of all, the state law side, as well as the entire political activity of the UPR's leaders from the beginning of their emigration history. We are not doing this now, because we are striving for a political consolidation in which all

The political factors involved are on the right political platform, part of an unshakable independent and unionist state structure, and will carry out the right work in it, which has been tried and tested. We have in mind the current liberation policy and the prospects for the future, so it would be unnecessary to raise negative aspects if there are guarantees that they belong only to the past and that this political camp is taking the right positions. Unless it was otherwise. Then it would be necessary to prevent the negatives from the past from making the struggle for the future more difficult or burdensome. Then there would be a need to deal with those negatives.

When it comes to the concept of the UPR government, there is no way to avoid the fact that this political factor has in recent years so clearly demonstrated to the entire Ukrainian people and to the outside world its inability to carry out its own state-liberation political action that putting it at the head of the Ukrainian state-building struggle would, for this reason alone, be too damaging to the liberation cause.

Is it possible to seriously put before the Ukrainian people the top of the UPR as the highest factor that leads the liberation revolutionary struggle, that represents the Ukrainian revolutionary statehood, that gives the highest state completion to the irreconcilable dynamism and activity of the modern Ukrainian revolution? Can the two elements: the highest revolutionary activism and the extreme inactivity and opportunism of the UPR, even in the hottest moments, be combined into a political whole so that this latter is the guiding and flagship one? Or maybe Ukrainian liberation politics should have looked like this: the liberation revolution is one thing, and the "government" - of the other? Is it possible to concentrate all political energy and mobilise all the forces of the people in a single-minded liberation struggle? Is it possible in this way to create a correspondingly strong front of independent policy against Bolshevik totalitarian imperialism? Or, in the opinion of the emigrant UPR camp, the Ukrainian cause then appear in its strongest form at an international forum and gain the best possible position?

Today, in the international balance of power, Ukraine is like a volcano of liberation revolution that can neither be extinguished nor strangled. It is

is a source of constant upheaval in the unnatural political structure in Eastern Europe. Ukraine is an implacable force that fights against any rider, against any enslavement. It acts exclusively according to its own law and has its own steady course towards a united, sovereign Ukrainian state. In the midst of the most difficult conditions, Ukraine not only continues its struggle, but also lives its own life, formalised in an underground state. The Ukrainian people are not only conducting their own struggle, but are now becoming the centre, organiser and leading force of a common anti-Bolshevik liberation front of all the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism. Ukraine is a historical gravedigger of Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism, oppression and violence, and at the same time a pioneer and crystallising centre for a new order on the ruins of the USSR, an order of freedom and justice in relations between free peoples and people. This is Ukraine's historical mission, its actual role today, and it is gaining a global position in accordance with this.

But for the strongest concentration and intensity of its own potentiality, for the highest combat capability and achievement of the greatest foreign political success, the whole of independent Ukraine, all its forces, must constitute not only one whole in general. This integrity must also have an appropriate internal structure and a corresponding flagging and external form; all elements of this integrity must be in their proper place, the most prominent ones must lead, give direction and expression to the integrity.

These requirements are best met by the revolutionary state formation led by the UHHR. Because it grew organically in Ukraine out of living reality, during the struggle, and was formed for the needs of this struggle and under the direct influence of all the forces and pressures among which it had to exist, act and grow. Therefore, in this formation, all the components are in their natural place, according to their specific burden and their own potential and function in their entirety. Also, the external forms, as in all organic works, are adjusted there to live in their own environment. The Ukrainian independent state formation should appear before the outside world in the same form. Because this form best emphasises all of its previously mentioned features and specifics, and this is our main strength, our most important trump card.

A revolutionary state formation born on native lands has

As well as being the centre, the main log cabin and the main stump, it should provide a state-organisational framework for the inclusion of all emigrant independent forces and factors in one whole. All of them can find their place in it, being included in the appropriately developed foreign part of the same whole.

With regard to the state tradition, which is always invoked by UPR circles, we acknowledge that from this point of view they have their historical positions. However, we do not agree with the view that the continuation of state traditions is inextricably linked to individuals or a political group. We believe that it is more closely associated with lively political action and liberation struggle, which further implements these traditions and competes for their implementation in living political reality.

The preservation of state traditions does not consist in firmly holding on to the formal, but even more so to the personal "tradition" itself, i.e., from the former role and positions of individuals or groups to derive their unaltered, exclusive right not only to represent the past, but also to occupy such positions and personal positions in the current Ukrainian political reality that their current activities no longer justify. Recognisers of this understanding of state traditions often ask, as the highest and most decisive criterion, whether individual phenomena and the entire development of living political reality and the liberation struggle fit into this external, formal framework, and even more so, whether it respects their "traditional" personal "governance". If they do, then they are, in their view, statehood facts, in line with tradition. If not, then they do not recognise them, they denigrate them as phenomena that are against statehood traditions, even though their exclusive content was precisely the struggle for the very essence of statehood to be not only a tradition, but also a real reality (the development of a real political reality and liberation struggle).

But state traditions cannot be interpreted in a museum-like manner. Anyone who wants to guard their preservation has not so much the right as the duty to make every effort to ensure that the most essential content of statehood is not reduced to the role of a mere historical order, that it does not belong to the past, but that it includes the present and the future, that it is a living reality. It is about the content itself, not about personnel or less important formal matters. Preserving the statehood tradition means

means not relegating it to museums, but linking it to current state struggles, and helping to ensure that the historical permanence between current state struggles and the tradition from the past is maintained, and that this is mainly in terms of positive content. The most important thing is the content, the essence, and not formal matters such as names, etc., or personal or group issues.

Appreciating the importance of tradition in the statehood struggle, we are in favour of the implementation and continuation of all the most valuable and positive content in the tradition of our statehood, but we are against the appropriation of a "monopoly or tradition", against formalism and against the very preservation of statehood traditions as museum values.

Returning to the UPR, we believe that this political factor initially had perhaps the most opportunities, and thus obligations, to continue the statehood traditions in further liberation struggles and in a consistent policy of independence. However, the development of the liberation struggle in the last two decades, in particular since the beginning of the Second World War, the struggle that is the most significant continuation of Ukrainian statehood traditions, does not provide the UPR with the political evidence that would justify their claims to the highest position in Ukrainian political life.

The Ukrainian statehood struggle continues unabated, it has had and continues to have its own heroic deeds and great political achievements, and it continues the Ukrainian state traditions in the most distinctive way. Meanwhile, the political camp of the UPR not only does not play the role it claims to play in them, but in general it either does not manifest itself at the most important moments of the liberation struggle of recent years, or the side that does not help but hinders the liberation struggle. By stepping down from the position of a leading factor in the struggle for statehood, the UPR's factors thus 'stepped down from the first position in continuing the state tradition. The new, revolutionary forces of Ukraine, which have taken over most of the current struggle for statehood, have become the guardians of these traditions, the guardians of Ukrainian statehood.

Outlining our concept of consolidation of all independent

elements in the emigration and the concept of unification of Ukrainian independence policy, it is necessary to clarify our attitude to the tendencies put forward by the UPR group, i.e., that political groups consolidate around the political centre of the UPR, which should be recognised by the same groups as the Ukrainian government in exile.

The concept of the UPR has no basis in the position and role of that group in the contemporary Ukrainian political reality, in particular in the current liberation struggle, because this concept does not correspond to the state and needs of the current liberation struggle in Ukraine and the entire liberation policy. Also, the recall of the UPR circles to their administrations in the name of statehood traditions is not justified.

However, as we have already noted, we do not want to touch upon the historical role of the UPR here, nor do we deny that positive elements in that camp could now and in the future make a positive contribution to the continuation of the struggle for Ukraine's state independence.

The UPR circles are trying to oppose the revolutionary state formation led by the UGVR - the "UPR government". As we can see, on the one hand, there is the non-involvement of the UPR factors in the liberation struggle of Ukraine and in all state acts and actions in Ukraine in recent years, and on the other hand, there are attempts to oppose themselves from exile to the facts and factors that have created and shaped the state struggle and independent state life of Ukraine in recent years and now. This position of the UPR factors makes it impossible for them to find a place for themselves in the structure of active independent forces of Ukraine and to join the modern state struggle and actions, if the UPR wants to continue to present itself as a revolutionary state formation of Ukraine that grew out of the struggle itself. In this case, the UPR group puts itself outside the framework of the modern liberation struggle and takes a position where active liberation politics must bypass it, i.e. eliminate it.

And it is precisely this political group of the UPR that brings us to an alternative opposition: "either - or". This alternative is false and harmful to the whole liberation cause, and even more so to the group itself. In Ukrainian domestic political life, many unnecessary conflicts and controversies arise from the fact that political factors in their relations very often put things in such a way that it turns out

simply opposition between them where it does not exist. The reason is that we have many political groups, particularly in exile, but the process of political differentiation and crystallisation of individual political trends is immature. Individual political camps do not have their own inherent political content, worldview, programme, tactics or a stable direction of political work sufficiently developed and formalised. As a result, they do not have their own political line, and in order to maintain their party-organisational separateness, they take either an opposition or a deliberately competitive position against the active forces in Ukrainian politics as the content of their group existence. The worst problem of internal Ukrainian political life lies in the fact that certain political groups, which, given their composition, should have their own political face, try to take the position of another political factor. When there is no corresponding serious action on their part, which should be carried out on the positions to which they claim to be entitled, but only imaginary, petty, propaganda manoeuvres, this results not in creative struggle and competition, but in chaos in political life and undermining, reducing the success of the positive work of active political forces.

If each Ukrainian political factor has its own developed, crystallised and formalised political content and face, the intent, direction and nature of its political work, then it will have its own place in Ukrainian political life, and will perform its own, defined function in its entirety. Relationships between them will also then be natural and tangible, and the whole system of political forces will be distinct and formalised. On the one hand, it will have room for healthy creative development, for constant competition between different political directions and forces. And this will be a factor of progress and activation, because then there will be a process of mutual refinement, complementation and alignment of positive elements and at the same time the elimination of negative elements, a political synthesis of various forces and actions - whether organised or natural, in the very consequences of the activities of all components. Then, instead of a situation where some people are engaged in struggle and positive political work, while others say they are doing the same and even better, but in fact only make the work of the former more difficult, there will be

a change in the direction that, in addition to rivalry, each factor will do its own work and perform a function that the other does not do or perform.

In today's Ukrainian political reality, in our current state of affairs, there really cannot be too many forces and too much work done: there is still a need for both. There is room and work for all forces, different tasks in different directions, so that all factors can surely make their positive value and contribution. The only that is needed is that everyone cares first and foremost about the good of Ukraine, the Ukrainian cause, and then about their party's good; that everyone wants to really fight or work positively for the common cause, and that everyone seeks their own place of work, according to their abilities, and not try to fit in with others and use the achievements of others.

In Ukrainian life today, there is not much to share for use and . But there is a lot to be done and gained through sacrifice and work. It is so crowded that it is impossible to crowd in, perhaps only with political or social gutter. But in struggle and work, there is plenty of room for everyone, more than enough people who are willing and have good will.

Our concept of consolidation is the concept of uniting and connecting all national forces to fight and work together on a common state platform and within the broadest state framework. It is not a consolidation to distribute influences and positions among contractual political groups. The first and foremost prerequisite for full internal Ukrainian consolidation is that the principle of the liberation struggle and creative work for the cause of liberation and state independence should be in the forefront of Ukrainian life, both in general and in all its constituent elements; that all elements and problems of internal Ukrainian life should be evaluated by this criterion. Then, in the name of a common idea and a great national need, the unifying, common moments would prevail in the assessment of all phenomena and factors, and the question of what positive contribution each element makes to the whole would be of primary importance. In consolidation, instead of group exclusivity and narrow party "either/or" against other political factors, mutual tolerance and the synthesising principle of "both

- i". Do not reject any factor that can and wants to make a positive contribution to the common goal, but eliminate only harmful elements.

When it comes to the question of what place each factor should occupy in the whole system, two things should be decided: first, the main direction, content and nature of the whole system of political forces and the question of which political formation best meets the current needs; second, the role each factor actually plays in this. What is needed is not just a mechanical conglomeration of different political forces and factors, which, in addition to their specific tasks and individual goals, should act in the same direction, along the same general line of independent policy. Our consolidation concept seeks to ensure that political groups and other political factors, while maintaining their own existence and activities, become part of a single higher-order whole, which in the struggle, as well as in relation to the outside world, and in the settlement of major internal Ukrainian affairs, will act as an organic whole. Such an organised integrity of Ukrainian political forces must not only exist; it must fulfil the tasks outlined, it must conduct the liberation struggle and an independent Ukrainian policy, its internal structure and external design must be appropriate to the general state, situation and needs of the whole liberation cause, in particular to the situation and the liberation struggle in Ukraine. A completely different, different line of liberation policy, a different political character and face would have been pursued by the consolidated political forces in exile, depending whether it was consolidation on the basis of the UHHR state formation or under the guise of the emigrant government of the UPR, or mechanical, faceless and conceptless inter-party agreement. There is no ambiguity or doubt about this. We are talking about our liberation concept, about the direction and content of our independent policy. And this must be resolved. This was fully completed in our native lands, and is completed in stages in emigration.

If the development of political life in exile continued in such a way that, at a time when all active, independent forces and elements were united in the state formation of the UHHR, an opposing opportunist camp would have rallied around the UPR, then it would have come to an exclusive "either/or" opposition. As a result of the whole active

of an independent policy based on the struggle in the region, all those elements and values that were in the opportunist camp would disappear, as well as those that could play a positive role in an independent policy if they did not oppose themselves to the way of active forces but joined it, combined with its corresponding elements. In the "either/or" opposition, everything that is included in the negative or inferior structure, even if it is a respectable, positive value, is eliminated from the actual positive work. On the other hand, when all national forces are included in the superordinate higher order, along with further internal rivalisation, but without opposition, even small positive values and elements are not wasted, but together with other values of that category, they bind the corresponding positions of the whole. This would be the main effect in the sense of saving political energy by consolidating heterogeneous and different political elements.

The considerations presented in this article lead to such conclusions.

In the Ukrainian political debate, the question of liberation, the liberation struggle, the foundations and main direction of liberation politics is at the forefront. The alternative is as follows: liberation, revolutionary struggle and a thoroughly active liberation policy, the main focus and basis of which is this struggle, or passive opportunism, orientation and waiting for the so-called conjuncture, for liberation by external factors. This means: whether or not to wage a liberation struggle and whether or not to pursue an independent, thorough and active liberation policy. But there is no compromise, no way out, and there can be only one solution. Ukrainian independence politics can only go the one way, which was directed and implemented by the independence revolutionary movement, and in one revolutionary state formation of Ukraine, led by the UHHR. This is the first main principle of our liberation policy.

The second important problem in exile is the issue of political consolidation. This is, first of all, a question of saving political energy, a demand to gather all forces in one non-partisan state formation, for joint, coordinated political action and liberation, rather than for the sake of consolidation itself.

How struggle and political action are a way and a means to state

liberation, and consolidation should be a means of increasing strength and strengthening positions in the liberation struggle and in independent politics. This is its meaning. Consolidation must be subordinated to the first postulate, linked to it and so aligned with it as to strengthen, supplement and accelerate its implementation. Separated from the purpose it is supposed to serve, it would lose its basic meaning, and directed against that purpose would be a harmful and negative phenomenon.

The first postulate will surely be realised in emigration. This will be ensured by the strength and inspiration of the revolutionary liberation movement, as well as the ideological and political stance of a healthy part of the Ukrainian emigration that seeks to make a positive contribution to the cause of liberation.

As for the consolidation of emigrant political groups and factors, it will largely depend on them. The good of the liberation cause as a whole, as well as purely party rationality and the benefit of the groups themselves speak for their participation.

The integrity of liberation politics will be undoubtedly benefited if those political factors that still do not follow the only correct path of liberation politics, but which can contribute their positive values, take part in the consolidation process on the platform and within the UHHRU. But this matter is even more important for the political factors and groups themselves, because for them it resolves the question of the grounds and prospects for their further existence. More than one political group that missed the mark on active, truly liberation politics and therefore lost the rationale for its existence, is getting an unusual opportunity to correct its mistakes, to join a united liberation front, to take a place in state formation to which the future belongs, even though it did nothing to create it. This is an opportunity to take the right position from now on, to take a positive part in the unfolding of the liberation struggle, and thus to win a place in the state-building of Ukraine.

However, it would be a mistake to ascribe too much importance to the position of individual groups. Most of them are weak and have no influence on the development of events. The masses themselves, imbued with political activism, with high political sophistication and sound instincts, are actively involved in political life and pass over those groups that do not keep pace with the whole development

of the liberation cause. The same masses now become the main political factor in emigration. In the process of consolidation, the political finality and the expedient line of active political forces, together with the cooperating masses, will outweigh the eventual inhibiting effects of various groups. And the position of these groups will decide not so much whether the consolidation process will be completed, but rather whether they will find their own place in the Ukrainian domestic political reality.

The liberation struggle and its independent policy will continue its firm and unstoppable march to victory. They will be led by all active, independent forces, united in one independent, revolutionary state formation, led by the UHHR. All political elements must take their positions. Those who march will win. Those who oppose or hesitate will put themselves in a position where all the achievements of the liberation cause will be their failures, its triumphs will be their defeats, its victories will be their downfalls, and its glory will be their

- his infamy. This would be a position very close to that of the enemy, though not in intentions, but still in consequences. To take such a position now, when we have the opportunity to take a positive position, would be foolish and suicidal from the national point of view of our own political good.

Everyone, every political factor, every group, will have to choose one side or the other. And soon.

All healthy national elements and all positive, sober political factors will surely find their proper place and their creative role in a united liberation front. The entire healthy Ukrainian emigration will unite with the liberation struggle in Ukraine in unanimous independent political action, in a single independent state formation, under the leadership of the revolutionary supreme state body of Ukraine - the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council.

## **Towards a new liberation policy**

*Signed by the pseudonym C. A. Gray is a continuation of the previous article, aimed at clarifying for the Ukrainian community in foreign lands what, in the name of what and by what means it should, having consolidated, politically fight. The author clarifies the essence, content and process of the Ukrainian national liberation revolution, the unreality of evolutionary concepts, the nature of the Moscow-Bolshevik regime and system, the three phases of the revolution, its liberation concept and strategy. These topics are expanded and deepened in other articles by C. Bandera, as: "State Policy Against the Bolshevik Game in the CCCP", "The Plainness of the Revolutionary Struggle in the Land", "The Ukrainian National Revolution, Not Just Anti-Regime Resistance", "A Word to the Ukrainian Nationalist Revolutionaries", "Prospects for the Ukrainian National Liberation Revolution".*

*This article was originally published in the journal Liberation Politics, Munich, year of publication. I, no. 9-10, November-December 1946; part of the weekly "The Way of Victory", Munich, year of publication. Viii, no. 1- 2 (358-359), 3 7. 1. 1961 p.*

## **The essence, content and process of the Ukrainian revolution**

The Ukrainian national revolution is a struggle for the very life and will of the people and the individual, as well as a struggle for the content, foundations and forms of life, for its development and progress; it is a struggle against Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism, which seeks to dominate the entire world and, to that end, enslaves, exploits and mutilates peoples and individuals; it is a struggle against the Bolshevik-Communist system, which, in the name of a speculative doctrine and in the service of one party's imperialism, is carrying out the most horrific experiment in history on the body of two hundred million masses of enslaved peoples, contrary to the nature, will and good of entire peoples and human beings; This is a struggle against the regime and tyranny of the Bolshevik Communist Party, which, out of a thirst for unlimited arbitrary power and its own benefits, has turned the masses of enslaved peoples into slaves and the greatest beggars; this is a struggle to defend the very existence of freedom and development of all peoples,

enslaved by Bolshevism, and for the defence of the human, free and dignified life of the masses and of every individual.

Ukrainian nationalism has its own set of positive ideas and values that define the content and forms of life and development of the people and the unit in all areas, and recognise their creative role in the progress of mankind. The basic truths of our ideas are rooted in the Ukrainian spirituality, formulated and affirmed throughout the course of historical development, a spirituality that harmonises with the best achievements of the development of universal spiritual and socio-political culture and progress. Our truths are diametrically opposed to the spirit and essence of Moscow Bolshevism, which collects, repeats, and refines the manifestations of the blackest reaction and fall from the entire history of mankind, with the negative use of the material and technical progress appropriated by Bolshevism.

Our idea of freedom, identity and free development of peoples is opposed to Bolshevik enslavement, levelling and extermination of entire peoples. The idea of dignity and respect for human beings, their free development, their own initiative, their creative and dignified self-inclusion in the harmonious way of collective national and social life is diametrically opposed to Bolshevik tyranny, the enslavement and exploitation of people, the trampling of their dignity, and the destruction of freedom.

Our idea of social justice is in contrast to the Bolsheviks' false abuse of social slogans to deceive the masses of foreign peoples and to cover up the most reactionary social oppression in the USSR as a whole.

Our idea of equality and brotherhood of all people in the nation is in contrast to the Bolshevik class theory and its practice, which turns the masses into slaves and beggars on the one hand, and gives unlimited domination and arbitrariness to the ruling clique of the Communist Party on the other.

Our idea of the positive, creative role of the state, which should defend, organise and promote free life and the development of cultural progress and economic well-being of the people and the individual, is opposed to the Bolshevik system of oppression, exploitation and disfigurement of the individual and the masses by the state, one big concentration camp.

The idea of directing the activities and efforts of the state and the people's community organised within it to the creation, completion and multiplication of positive values that enrich and raise the standard of living of the people and the individual in all spheres, multiplying their creative contribution to the treasury of human progress and culture is in contrast to the empty Bolshevik imperialism, which, out of a senseless lust for domination over the whole world, wants to turn everything into instruments of its violence and conquest.

Respect for the heterogeneity of the content and forms of life and the richness of cultures of different peoples, the idea of tolerance towards alien and different cultural and social values and systems, along with attachment to one's own, and the cherishing of one's own values are in contrast to the Moscow-Bolshevik intolerance and hatred of everything that is different, small-minded, and the desire to destroy foreign cultures and entire peoples, to level the lives of all people, all peoples, to the same standard and taste of the Bolshevik regime, born out of a sense of inferiority.

Coexistence of free peoples and peaceful relations between their independent states, regardless of the differences in social and political systems, instead of the Bolshevik constant hostility, complete isolation and permanent, open or covert, war against the small world.

The idea of the freedom of creative initiative of the individual and free activity that does not threaten or harm fellow citizens and the nation is directed against Bolshevik totalitarianism and dictatorship, which deprives a person of all freedom, makes him a slave of the extortionist state and shackles his creative forces with the shackles of an all-powerful totalitarian communist monopoly.

The idea of freedom of religion, conscience, thought and speech, free spiritual, cultural and artistic creativity - against violence against the spirit of peoples and human beings, against the imposition of Bolshevik doctrine and its templates in spiritual, cultural and artistic life and creativity by means of terror.

Faith in man, his noble, positive attributes and impulses, his social instinct, the cherishing and elevation of those good pages of human nature - is opposed to Bolshevik hatred and contempt for man and the system of coercion, violence and the most horrific terror it has generated.

The idea of natural harmony, balance and co-play between spiritual and material elements in the life and development of humanity is addressed against the forced imposition of the artificial, speculative materialistic doctrine of communism on everyone and everything, and the unnatural bending of life to its understandings and statements.

In the spirit of these ever-new and unchanging basic ideas, Ukrainian nationalism has developed an entire programme as a system of guidelines, principles and values that determine the content and forms of life and development of the nation and the unit in all areas. That programme includes what is of Ukrainian past that has retained its value and relevance, and what corresponds to the current state and development of knowledge and progress.

Our programme adopts the best achievements of knowledge and progress in all spheres of life of other nations, which correspond to our spiritual and cultural elements, and to the social and natural conditions of life in Ukraine.

The ideas and programme of the Ukrainian revolution outline a progressive content and form of life, completely opposite to the reactionary Bolsheviks. Although the Bolsheviks appropriated the achievements of others in the field of technology and material civilisation, and used some of the means, methods and forms chosen by the people during the revolution, they used all this in the service of a reactionary nature and equally reactionary goals.

In contrast to the reactionary Bolshevik reality, the ideas and programme of the Ukrainian national revolution lead to a radical restructuring of the whole of life, in all its areas and manifestations. The revolutionary struggle for this positive content is ongoing.

The Ukrainian national revolution is a continuous, ongoing and progressive process that encompasses and encompasses a lifetime; its system of positive ideas and values stands against the Bolshevik system not as an abstract theory and doctrine, but as a living and active dynamic force.

By responding to the spirit, nature, desires and interests of the broad masses of the people, setting specific goals for them, what should be the content, way of life and forms of a whole life, showing them the real way to reach these goals, the ideas and programme of the Ukrainian revolution, together with active revolutionary struggle, mobilise and activate the masses of the people to fight for their full realisation through the destruction of Bolshevism. An essential feature of our revolution is the growing

the unfolding, intensification and deepening of the process of comprehensive struggle against the Bolshevik system of reaction for the realisation of progressive goals. Involving the broad masses of the people, this struggle is taking place in all areas of life: political, social, economic, spiritual, cultural, religious, etc. The masses of the people resist the Bolshevik system, do not allow it to take root and easily achieve its goals, and wage an offensive against it, forcing the regime to make concessions and constantly change its ideology.

Our revolution is on the constant offensive, its ideas and programme are winning in the clash with Bolshevik reality because they are true, worthwhile and stronger. That is why they are capturing ever wider masses of people, spreading among other peoples enslaved by Bolshevism, capturing and revolutionising them, and even penetrating the ranks of the regime itself and partially decomposing it, capturing the most valuable units.

### ***The unreality of evolutionary concepts The nature of the Bolshevik regime and system***

This process of the growing pressure of revolutionary ideas is essential for our revolution, but it does not exhaust our revolutionary struggle. It alone would not lead to a complete victory, would not force Bolshevism to such a step-by-step retreat that would end in a revolutionary change, a transformation of the content and forms of life from the Bolshevik system along the lines of our programme. This is impossible, both because of the very nature of Bolshevism and its system, and because of the state of the regime and its attitude to the peoples it has enslaved.

The Bolshevik regime is essentially in a continuous struggle against the masses of the peoples it has subjugated, in which it cannot survive without its communist system of coercion. The Bolshevik regime and the system are so interconnected that if one falls, the other will fall, one cannot exist without the other and cannot be betrayed without suicide. It is impossible to completely break the Bolshevik regime ideologically and morally because it has neither ideas nor morals at all. Instead of ideas, it has only one goal - to rule and dominate the subjugated peoples and to subjugate others; to rule in the most absolutist way, by means of total dictatorship and terror. Such domination gives the ruling clique - the party - everything that the greedy, idealess

the individual wishes for himself. Instead of morality, the Bolsheviks have one principle: everything that serves their purposes, that is useful to them, must be accepted, and everything that stands in the way can and should be destroyed by all means.

Bolshevism does not recognise the concepts of good and evil, crime and law, honour and shame, permissible and impermissible means and methods as its obligatory norms, but deceitfully uses them in relation to the subjugated and other peoples as means, elements of Bolshevik dialectics and tactics.

Only elements of ideological and moral value can be reached and wrested from the ranks of the regime by ideas and moral offensive. But there are not many of them.

The main pillar of the Communist Party and the Bolshevik regime an ideological and immoral element that knows only one thing: to have everything through unlimited power, or not to exist. Such an element, which is the core of the Bolshevik regime and party, cannot be influenced by ideological and moral values, it can only be destroyed.

For this one purpose - the dictatorship of party domination, to which the Bolsheviks eventually admitted from the very beginning - they built their system, using only the screen of the proletariat, and are constantly consolidating and improving it. In it, they used all the models of dictatorship, terror, and the system of turning the masses and peoples into an obedient instrument of power in the hands of a small group of people. Having selected and compiled the most refined models known to human history, they harnessed the achievements of modern technology to the services of that dictatorship. The whole Bolshevik system was perfected in two aspects: total dictatorship within, and the exploitation of the people, peoples and means of the country in the creation of an instrument of force for imperialist expansion.

Bolshevism deforms the whole life of the USSR in such a way as to assure itself of the unconditional subordination and obedience of the masses. For this purpose, it destroys all human communities, especially the strongest ones - the family and the nation. It brings the whole of society to such a degree of fragmentation that the regime always has to deal with a lone individual. The state control of the whole life, primarily the economic life, creates a situation where the regime directly owns all the means of life, and the citizen, deprived of them and any possibility of independent activity and subsistence, constantly lives "at the mercy" and on starvation rations from the state, and for the slightest attempt of disobedience he is deprived of the opportunity to live. B

In the future, through the destruction of religion and all small-minded values, the imposed materialist doctrine and the entire Bolshevik system of education are intended to help the regime reduce man to the role of a slave, who, driven only by the fear of losing the minimal means of subsistence that he can only obtain through submission to the regime, will be an obedient tool in everything.

The communist system of totalitarian state capitalism must limit the internal exploitation of all the holes to the lowest possible minimum and use all the material resources of the sub-Bolshevik countries for the purposes of external exploitation. Having mastered the lives of all peoples and all people in the USSR, the Bolshevik system forges them and their material resources into one instrument for violence and subjugation of the world.

The system of lies, which the Bolsheviks have pushed to its furthest limits, is one of the main components of Bolshevik tactics. It is designed to paralyse and take over the souls and minds of people in the USSR and beyond its borders.

The Bolshevik state omnipotently controls not only the collective but also the individual life of each person, and the Bolshevik state is owned and used as an instrument by the criminal communist party  
- a union of anti-national and anti-human conspirators, with the USSR regime at its head.

Just as it is impossible to break the Bolshevik regime with ideological pressure alone, the Bolshevik system cannot be destroyed by partially overcoming it and dealing with it in isolated areas or stages. This can only undermine it, weaken it, but not eliminate it or force it to undergo an evolutionary change. Because Bolshevism is not based on the value and stability of its principles, doctrine and method of organising life, but on violence and terror, which it nurtures and constantly strengthens and which it always uses as its argument. In totalitarian Bolshevism, the communist system and regime and the dictatorship of the regime form two inseparable parts of the same whole, so connected that as long as one of them lives, the other revives, if it were to fall.

Bolshevism can be destroyed not by evolutionary means, but only by total revolutionary reprisal, in which an organised revolutionary force, with the direct active participation of the broadest masses, will tear apart and uproot

the main elements of Bolshevism - the regime, the party, the system and the doctrine, and all their branches and manifestations. The process of revolutionary struggle must be concentrated and completed in this final massacre. Only after the defeat of Bolshevism and the overthrow of the Bolshevik prison of the peoples - the USSR - will the positive ideas and programme of the revolution be put into practice.

### ***Three phases of the revolution***

The Ukrainian national revolution, as a unanimous process, consists of three phases. The first and second are the phases of struggle, and the third is state-building.

In the first phase, there is a process of protracted, progressive underground struggle. It is a struggle primarily for the souls of the masses, their mobilisation and activation on the side of the revolution, against Bolshevism; the positions of the Bolshevik system and the forces of the Bolshevik regime are undermined, and the organised power of the revolution grows. In this phase, a fundamental constructive process takes place: our ideas and programme take hold of the broadest masses of the Ukrainian people, spread to other peoples oppressed by Bolshevism, determine for them the desired content and forms of life in all areas, and become guidelines for their actions - They mobilise and organise competitions for the implementation of our programme.

The second phase, as a continuation of the first, is the phase of liberation. In this phase, the protracted liberation struggle comes to an end, and all forces are concentrated in the direct open struggle against the Bolshevik regime and its forces, in the final general breakdown of the peoples.

The third phase is the construction of independent national states on the site of the USSR destroyed, ensuring their independence from the outside, implementing the ideas and programme of the liberation revolution in the state and social order, in the content and construction of a whole life.

We are living in the first phase, on the eve of the second. All forces and all revolutionary action are directed towards the path of the liberation revolutionary struggle, in accordance with our liberation concept.

The very basis of our revolutionary concept is the idea and programme of a common liberation and revolutionary struggle of all peoples,

enslaved by Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism. Bolshevism must be dug up and completely destroyed wherever it prevails.

This is the only way to overcome it. Moscow imperialism in its Bolshevik form must be destroyed in all the countries it has conquered, independent national states must be established in place of the USSR, and the Russian state must be limited to ethnographically Russian lands.

Restricting the liberation struggle of each nation to its own national borders, conducting the liberation struggle of each nation separately, uncoordinated with the struggle of other peoples, only give the Bolsheviks a more favourable position, allowing them to localise individual pockets of revolution, exploit their separation and defeat one enemy after another. We put an equal sign between the Ukrainian revolution and the liberation of all peoples enslaved by Bolshevism. We see the key to the success of our struggle in the fact that it will spread to other peoples and will bring them all to the point where they will conduct their liberation struggles in one common, coordinated revolutionary action. The burden of this struggle will be spread over all nations, not only Ukraine itself will be the centre of the revolution and not only Ukrainians will be the revolutionary element. The common anti-Bolshevik front will also embrace other peoples, and their masses will also become active in the struggle to such an extent that a unanimous front of all elements and forces hostile to it will be created around the isolated regime and its servants. The success of our liberation struggle gives other peoples the same chances to liberate themselves.

Every liberation struggle of one people that weakens Bolshevism and leads to its overthrow equally helps the liberation cause of other peoples enslaved by Bolshevism. The common anti-Bolshevik front is that the revolutionary struggles of all peoples form one coordinated whole, have one common, general plan and strategy, and each revolutionary movement is also aimed at strengthening the struggle of other peoples. All the revolutionary, active anti-Bolshevik elements and forces are fighting wherever they can against every part of the Bolshevik force. Everyone joins the anti-Bolshevik liberation front, and if they cannot fight directly in the ranks of their national revolutionary forces, they join the struggle

The Ukrainians are fighting in a common liberation front that will bring liberation to their people.

With such a common front of all the enslaved peoples, the Bolsheviks will no longer be able to localise and disperse the forces of the revolutionary struggle. There will be no more room for their tactic of defeating individual peoples one by one, for the tactic of defeating one people with the help of the sons of another people who are indifferent to its affairs, and for dispersing the revolutionary forces through resettlement and the creation of a national mix, especially in the army and in large workers' centres. If the same, common liberation struggle is waged everywhere, if the masses of all peoples understand that the struggle of every other people is a common struggle, and thus their own, then the dispersal and transfer of revolutionary-minded masses from their homeland to distant countries will not help the Bolsheviks and will not break the forces of the revolution, because everyone will be able to do the same in every place.

One of the strongest engines of the victory of the people's liberation revolution is cooperation and collaboration, both between the allied liberation movements and between units, revolutionaries of all nationalities in the anti-Bolshevik front.

### ***Liberation concept and strategy revolution***

The leading goal of the OUN's activities and struggle at this stage is to achieve an independent, united Ukrainian state. We subordinate everything to this goal, everything must serve it.

Our concept of liberation is the revolutionary struggle of Ukraine and other peoples enslaved by Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism in a common anti-Bolshevik front. Continuous, constantly deepening, spreading and gradual revolutionary action, conducted in various forms, as a socio-political and insurgent-military revolutionary struggle, must lead to a general, open revolutionary breakdown of the broadest masses of the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism, which will be the final reprisal against the Bolshevik regime, imperialism and system.

The revolutionary strategy is based on the fact that between Bolshevism, the regime and the system, the Bolshevik state-prison on the one hand

between the enslaved peoples, their masses and the individual, on the one hand, and the enslaved peoples, their masses and the individual, on the other, there are deep and sharp contradictions that run through life. They constantly give rise to clashes and conflicts in an unbroken chain, so the state of unquenchable struggle continues. The strategy of the revolution operates in the midst of these irreconcilable contradictions and conflicts, aims to mobilise and organise the revolutionary energy of the masses in order to focus and direct its action in order to bring about the final defeat of the enemy through the continuous and systematic destruction of its positions and strength.

Revolutionary tactics are aimed at using and strengthening all the processes that weaken and decompose the enemy, internal conflicts and contradictions in his camp. Revolutionary action step by step undermines the strength and position of the Bolshevik regime, making it more and more difficult and impossible for it to use the masses as its instrument of power.

The final massacre, the general revolutionary breakdown of the peoples will come when the revolutionary activation of the broadest masses of the peoples enslaved in the USSR reaches such a degree that when the initiating action - the strike of an organised revolutionary force against the Bolshevik regime - those masses will no longer be its submissive tools or passive spectators, but will stand on the side of the active revolution. There can be many such fiery speeches-explosions until the fire of general revolutionary disruption engulfs the masses.

A general breakdown, as the final reprisal against Bolshevism, could also come when the Bolshevik regime mobilises the masses for its own purposes and subjects them to extreme oppression (e.g. war).

Our liberation concept is a joint revolutionary liberation struggle of all peoples enslaved by Bolshevism. We are counting on their active participation in the struggle, on their organised revolutionary forces and on the revolutionary potentialities of the broad masses of these peoples. Our revolutionary political work is largely aimed at awakening and activating the revolutionary energy of other peoples - our natural allies, helping to form their organised revolutionary forces and mobilising their masses to fight.

Another equally important point is the creation of a common front,

spreading the idea of a common struggle, awakening among other peoples the consciousness that only through it is the road to their liberation, establishing faith in the strength and victory of the common liberation front of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Peoples. Out of the great, dispersed and broken revolutionary energy of the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism, we must create one powerful, coordinated force, conscious of its invincibility, a force that acts in a planned and united manner in the struggle.

The most important prerequisites for the development of the revolution and its victory in the general breakdown are the presence and action of an organised revolutionary force as the organiser and vanguard of the revolution - the revolutionary mobilisation and activation of the masses of the peoples of the anti-Bolshevik front; a planetary revolutionary strategy; a common organised front in the current revolutionary liberation struggle of the ABN.

Outside forces and the international political situation can auxiliary, but not decisive, favourable factors. We take them into account in this sense and use them, but we reject any orientation towards outside forces or the external situation, that they will bring liberation on their own and that it is enough to wait for them and to be in line with them.

We reject the evolutionary concepts - expect the USSR to evolve under external pressure or under the pressure of internal forces so that liberation will follow. Under coercion from the outside or from within, the Bolshevik regime can only make tactical manoeuvres, temporary concessions, playing for time.

We will use all the concessions and tactical retreats of the regime to strengthen revolutionary action. But liberation will be achieved only by revolution, through the total destruction of Bolshevism, by the peoples enslaved by it.

Ukraine is the central force in the liberation revolution of peoples.

## **The spotty nature of the revolutionary struggle in the region**

*The intensification of the revolutionary and liberation actions of the armed underground in Ukraine - the OUN-UPA - due to the enemy's stronger onslaught, mainly on the western edges of Ukrainian lands, in the so-called Zakerzonnia, required more work and effort from Ukrainians in the emigration in favour of the liberation struggle. In this regard, the article by C. A. Siryi's article "The Plainness of the Revolutionary Struggle in the Land" ("Liberation Politics", Munich, Yearbook, vol. 1 (18), 1948) examines the revolutionary strategy and the struggle for liberation in the region.) examines the revolutionary strategy and tactics of Ukrainian fighters in the underground and broadly clarifies the following points: the state of the Ukrainian people in the Soviet territories and in Zakerzonnia, the tasks of the Ukrainian national liberation revolution, the enemy's countermeasures in the fight against the OUN-UPA, raids by UPA units, and the failure of the agreement between the CCCP, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, drawn up to destroy the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.*

After the end of the Second World War, the liberation and revolutionary struggle in Ukraine entered a new phase. The strategy and tactics of the OUN and UPA's political and military revolutionary actions were selected and arranged in such a way as to consistently preserve and continue the main plan - the concept of the liberation revolution - in the new situation.

The common goal of liberation is the national liberation revolution of the entire Ukrainian people against Bolshevism, in a common front with other peoples enslaved by Bolshevism. This revolutionary and liberation struggle of the broadest masses of the people is increasingly spreading, sharpening and deepening, heading for its new unfolding in a national uprising. The revolutionary process penetrates all spheres of life, and its content is to oppose the hostile reality, goals and attempts of Bolshevism with its own ideas and goals of the liberation revolution, the ideas of national-political, social, economic, spiritual and cultural freedom of the people and the individual. This concept of liberation has been advocated and implemented by the OUN from the very beginning its activities, unchanged and consistent in all situations.

The main and essential thing in the revolutionary-liberation concept is the reliance on the struggle of the whole nation, its broadest masses, and not just organised forces. For the revolutionary forces in Ukraine, the OUN, UPA, and UGVR are the centre, the engine of the revolution, initiating and directing

The revolutionary process is a major factor in the revolutionary process, but not its only carrier and manifestation. The ultimate prerequisite for the success of the revolution is the active participation in the struggle of the broadest masses of the people of Ukraine and other peoples of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc. The degree of maturity of the revolution depends primarily on the revolutionisation of the masses, on their enthusiasm for the cause of liberation struggle and their readiness to fight actively themselves. Through active struggle, as well as through all their activities, the organised revolutionary forces mobilise and involve the entire Ukrainian people and allies from the DEA in the struggle, and show the masses the way to freedom. Between the struggle of the organised forces themselves and the degree to which revolutionary sentiment is spreading among the masses and their militancy, there must be, in the long run, a relationship such that the organised forces lead and the masses follow and work with them.

The strategy of the revolutionary struggle in the current phase is defensive and offensive, combining both moments simultaneously.

The revolutionary struggle paralyzes the enemy's attempts to break and stifle the revolution, its forces, action and capabilities, and at the same time, it consolidates, spreads and deepens the revolutionary process, activates the masses, covering more and more elements with anti-Bolshevik, revolutionary sentiments and actions by attacking more and more enemy positions. The strategy of the revolutionary struggle takes into account the general world situation, internal relations in the USSR and the developmental trends of both factors.

The internal situation in Ukraine, as well as in the USSR as a whole, and its foreign policy position are of great importance for the development of the revolution, for what will be the main basis and dominant content of the revolutionary process, and for the methods and means to spread, consolidate and hasten it.

The whole situation of the USSR, both external and internal, is decisively influenced by the prospect of conflict with the West and the real possibility of a near-term war. All Kremlin policies are under pressure from this central cause, increasingly concentrated around it and normalised by its demands. In particular, all Bolshevik domestic policy, especially economic policy, is increasingly directed from one angle - preparation for war. This gives the whole internal situation of the USSR, which was already constantly military in nature, a special acuteness. The entire life of the broad masses of the Bolshevik peoples is under constant

the growing pressure of the regime, which is trying to squeeze out of them the last means, all their strength in slave labour, all to increase military potential. This leads to poverty, exploitation, and unprecedented exploitation of the masses to the extreme, impossible limits. Against this background, the terror of the regime is growing even more, and on the other hand, the hatred of all the peoples under Bolshevik rule is growing.

This discontent of the masses, their extremely hostile attitude towards Bolshevism, the regime, the party, the communist economic system and the totalitarian system, has intensified since the war and is taking on more and more distinctly irreconcilably hostile forms. There are many reasons for this. First of all, the Bolshevik propaganda lies about the terrible poverty of the masses around the world, the low standard of living, economic and cultural backwardness of Western countries, the happy and "joyful" life of a Soviet person, and the superiority of the USSR over the capitalist world lost all influence. During the war, the masses of the Soviet army had the opportunity to see how things really were, and the truthful information spread throughout the USSR. Now Bolshevik propaganda has lost the trust among the people that it once had due to its refinement, intrusiveness and exclusivity. It is already alienating those who once believed it, brought up "under the sun of the Stalinist constitution".

The masses hoped that with the end of the war would come change, more freedom and better welfare. During the war, Bolshevik propaganda, including unofficial propaganda, supported such desires of the masses, even orchestrating relevant domestic political aspirations that aroused and confirmed hopes for change - the harmonisation of the domestic course. Immediately after the war, the returning army began to destroy the collective farm system in the entire USSR by "unauthorised" development of private households.

The Bolshevik regime, having somehow mastered the situation, responded by intensifying terror, recklessly returning to the previous state, cashiering and relentlessly pursuing "private gain". Instead of improvement, bitter disappointments came. In general, the USSR was sinking into unspeakable poverty. In addition to the inevitable consequences of the war, the chaos and ineptitude of the Bolshevik bureaucracy exacerbated the need. The social inequality of the dominant Bolshevik aristocracy - party, military and bureaucratic - is particularly aggravating,

which, in comparison to the needs of the working masses, lives in prosperity.

The regime is pushing the scales of terror and exploitation to their limits: a new five-year plan, new loans, new social competitions, preparations for a new war. All this creates extreme dissatisfaction, disorderly moods, and such hatred of Bolshevism that, despite the terror, the citizens of the former Soviet Union are no longer hiding everything inside themselves and are increasingly coming to open manifestations of the anti-regime sentiments of the masses. The only thing left of the hoped-for so-called internal evolution of Bolshevism is that the privileged position of the party, military and bureaucratic aristocracy is now openly acknowledged, while the life of the working masses is kept in a strictly communist, proletarian, i.e. needy state. In this way, the truth is even more clearly revealed that communism as a whole is in reality a system of the worst kind of state capitalism and totalitarianism, the worst kind of slavery, , robbery and exploitation of individuals and entire peoples by the imperialist state and the clique that has taken over. The communist theory that leads to, justifies and defends such practices is completely compromised in the eyes of all those with a sense of truth and common sense.

The only base and support of the Bolshevik regime, state, communist doctrine and system remained - a sophisticated system of brutal, comprehensive terror and sexism. This system covers and penetrates the entire USSR, all people and all life. Terror is moral, spiritual and economic. Sexuality permeates the entire state system, production, the army, school, family, church, and invades the confessional. This is the very nature of Bolshevism, its only, satanic force. The liberation revolution must first of all fight it, overcome it. All the other power factors of Bolshevism are merely servants and means, derivatives and offshoots of the system of terror and sexism, which rely on it and will fall with it.

After the last war, the hostility of Ukraine and other non-Russian peoples to Bolshevism on national and political grounds increased. The Bolshevik regime is increasingly openly favouring Russian chauvinism, exalting the "superiority" of the Russian people, Russian culture, etc over other peoples. It is more and more clearly pursuing a course of brutal obmoskovisation

of other peoples, of their entire lives.

The main reason for this lies *not* so much in the Russian patriotism of the Bolshevik leadership, but in its imperialist attitude and in the realisation that the strongest and most confident support for Bolshevik imperialism is Russian imperialism. The last war clearly showed that both Ukraine and all other non-Russian peoples were hostile to Bolshevism in their masses. Fighting to the death against Hitler's Germany, they did not want to fight on the same front as Bolshevik Moscow and, where they could, fought on two fronts simultaneously.

But the Russian people tied their fate to Bolshevism. The decisive factor in this was Russian national imperialism, which entered the bloodstream of the entire Russian people, and not sympathy for Bolshevism itself. On the contrary, the masses of the Russian people also have a strong hatred of communism and a desire to get rid of it. However, imperialist tendencies have prevailed, as well as the realisation that Bolshevism, as a doctrine, system and regime, realises the goals of Russian imperialism with the greatest energy, more radically and recklessly than any other Russian regime. In the political thought and in the desires of the imperialist-minded circles of the Russian people, the concept lives on that it is necessary to serve Bolshevism in the realisation of Russian imperialist goals, and at the appropriate time to eliminate the Bolshevik system by evolutionary means or by means of a coup d'état. But the Russian empire, defended and strengthened by Bolshevism, should remain as a legacy of Bolshevism.

Thus, between Russian national imperialism and imperialist Bolshevism, along with the enmity and contradictions that exist between them in matters of internal order, forms and content of national life in many areas, there is always agreement on one matter that is fundamental to both. Both are trying to maintain, consolidate and expand the Russian empire, to continue Russia's global expansion. Both factors treat each other as a means, each wants to use the other and then destroy it, but in practice, they cooperate and support each other.

After the experience of the last war, Bolshevism, preparing for the new one, is increasingly strengthening the Russian

imperialism, responds to it and combines it. In relation to Ukraine, as well as to all non-Russian peoples, the Russification course in all spheres of life is intensifying. Centralism and the colonial system in state, political and economic life, the halting and primitivisation of national and cultural development, and the extermination of any manifestation of national distinctiveness are being carried out without hesitation and in a completely open manner. Against this backdrop, elements of national hatred are increasingly growing, and the instinct for national self-preservation, lulled by communism, is also being strengthened among those elements of the Ukrainian people who have been exposed to it under the influence of communist education.

Both in Ukraine and in the USSR as a whole, there are many sharp contradictions, enmity and conflicts between Bolshevism and entire nations, the masses and the human unit. The hatred of the Bolshevik regime and system is so great that it does not need to be created or reinforced, it is done by the Bolsheviks themselves. This state of deep and general hostility of the peoples to Bolshevik reality

- This is the natural basis for the development of the national liberation revolution.

But hatred and passive hostility alone are not enough for liberation. The most important goal of the revolutionary strategy is to initiate and direct the process of actively opposing Bolshevik efforts in all spheres of life with one's own national aspirations, to involve the broad masses of the people in the struggle, to transform their passive hatred of Bolshevism into an active revolutionary attitude, into a conscious, planned action to destroy Bolshevism and the prison of the peoples - the USSR. In order to do this, we need to instil in the masses of the people the consciousness that the only real way to freedom is a liberation revolution of the peoples, to show them this way, to spread our concept, to establish faith in the possibility of a general anti-Bolshevik revolution, to teach them by example what to do and how to do it, and to instil in them the necessary revolutionary fervour. The whole hostility to the existing sub-Bolshevik reality must take shape as a conscious revolutionary instruction, as an orientation towards revolution, recognition of the concept and programme of the liberation revolution as their political faith, convictions, their own way, by which all peoples and every person from the sub-Bolshevik prison can reach freedom, human, free life and development.

The main problem of the revolution is to break through the influence of Bolshevik terror and propaganda and to make the masses aware of the fall of their power. They hate Bolshevism and are waiting for its fall, while at the same time obeying it and making heavy sacrifices for it. If they would stop oppressing themselves and each other under the orders of the Bolshevik regime and system for just a moment and instead strike at it, there would soon be no trace of it.

The strategy of the OUN-UPA's struggle is primarily aimed at revolutionising and activating the masses. Taking into account the development of the internal and external situation, the revolutionary action is conducted in such a way as to make the best possible use of the achievements of the previous stages, to consolidate them and further develop them. At the end of the war and in the first post-war year, the UPA's revolutionary insurgency gained a very wide scope. As a result, the ideas of the liberation revolution spread widely among the masses of various sub-Bolshevik peoples, including the soldiers of the Soviet Army, who were in contact with the UPA. Bolshevism was then triumphant after the fall of Germany, and Bolshevik propaganda stunned the citizens of the former Soviet Union with its shouting about the power, indivisibility and inviolability of the USSR and the Bolshevik system. And it was at that time that the UPA launched its guerrilla warfare to the fullest extent.

The Bolsheviks wanted to break down the Ukrainian revolutionary forces with one broad strike of the Soviet army, to "clear the field". But they failed. The UPA managed to emerge victoriously from major military campaigns against it using a guerrilla strategy. Moreover, a significant number of Red Army soldiers, having directly encountered the Ukrainian liberation movement, the heroic struggle of the insurgents, and our ideas, did not want to fight the UPA in the same way as the NKVD special forces did. The mass of Red Army soldiers were largely imbued with the ideas of the revolution. At that time, at the end of the war and in the first months after its end, large masses of people, mobilised or displaced by the war, moved through the Ukrainian lands covered by widespread revolutionary and guerrilla actions. They came into direct contact with revolutionary action, with its ideas and cries; they saw that the UPA and OUN existed and fought successfully, without any help from anyone else, and they became convinced that revolutionary struggle against the Bolshevik system was possible.

The idea of a joint

of the peoples' liberation revolution against Bolshevik imperialism, news of the UPA. The heroic struggle in Ukraine sowed the seeds of the liberation revolution throughout the USSR. Such a strong and widespread propaganda effect was possible only because such an intensive guerrilla and revolutionary propaganda campaign was launched at that time and in those circumstances. The activities and struggles of that period were of great importance for the development of a common anti-Bolshevik liberation front of all peoples enslaved by Bolshevism.

When one realises that this is the basis of the entire liberation concept, one can clearly understand the continuity of that struggle, the expediency and success of its widespread deployment at that time. We must look at the cause of the liberation revolution as a deep, long-term process that develops and gains strength through continuous and consistent continuation and expansion. The national liberation revolution is the work of the entire Ukrainian people and other peoples, the broad masses, and not just the organised revolutionary forces.

At the turn of 45-46, the international political situation entered a stage of "peaceful" interruption, which also affected internal relations in the USSR. At that time, the armed forces of the Ukrainian revolution reached the highest level of mobilisation. The revolutionary leadership was faced with the question: "whether to move towards an imminent general insurgent breakdown, or to extend and deepen the revolutionary process in a covert form for a long-term goal?"

The state of the active revolutionary forces of the UPA and OUN allowed the leadership of the liberation struggle to accelerate insurgency, spread and massify outright insurgency. Adopting such a plan would have been appropriate if the mass revolutionary uprising had soon spread and captured further territories and entire countries. However, in the situation at the time, it was not possible to count on the fact that the fire of the general revolutionary uprising would spread from the revolutionary-ripe Ukrainian lands not only to the whole of Ukraine but also to other sub-Bolshevik nations, that the majority of the Soviet army would follow the voice of their sympathies and actively take the side of the revolution. Despite their hatred of Bolshevism and sympathy for the liberation struggle, the masses of the former Soviet Union were not yet ready for their own active revolutionary struggle in a situation where the USSR had a fairly strong and stabilised external situation, without

major external or internal shocks. The influence of Bolshevik terror was still too strong, thanks to which the post-Soviet man was convinced of the strength of the Bolshevik regime and the futility of any resistance and uprising in the USSR; the belief that revolution was possible only during war or some internal cataclysm of the regime, and not in a peaceful situation, was still too strong. This was the mental state of the individual and the masses, systematically created and maintained by Bolshevik terror and propaganda, - is the greatest obstacle to liberation. It squashes the inner protest in the individual and turns him or her into powerless passivity. This condition cannot be broken in one fell swoop; it requires longer, deeper and more consistent revolutionary activity.

The question of the anti-Bolshevik revolution is, first of all, the question of the sub-Soviet man, of his inner rebirth, so that in the place of despair there is faith in the possibility of overthrowing Bolshevism.

, instead of suppressing internal protest and passive submission to terror, people should be imbued with the desire for active struggle, the willingness to do so, and the conviction that truth will ultimately triumph over evil. This is not the case with the spread of hatred of Bolshevism; it is everywhere, and it is best nurtured by the regime and the communist system itself. But the terror of the regime simultaneously feeds fear, hopelessness, despair, a sense of isolation in every individual, passivity and submission. All this must be overcome, it must be done by an organised revolutionary force. The most important means of doing so is not the most unfounded, instructive propaganda, but only living action - struggle, clear proof - example.

Therefore, leadership of the liberation struggle in the Krai adopted a long-term plan. It was necessary, first of all, to consolidate, deepen and spread what had been done so far in sowing the seeds of revolution in the USSR as a whole and in the revolutionary activation of the masses. With the end of the war, the masses of Red Army soldiers carried away from the UPA not only the concept, ideas and cries of the anti-Bolshevik revolution, but also the insight that in the sub-Bolshevik reality, revolutionary struggle could exist and be successfully waged, that an underground revolutionary force, an insurgent army, could survive and operate. However, in the soul of every enlightened person who had already sided with the revolution in his feelings and desires, a great doubt remained at the same time - a question: "but is it

will it hold out in times of peace, will it resist Bolshevik crushing pressure, and for how long?" This doubt can easily extinguish the light of a free man-revolutionary and return him to the darkness of passive slavery. This is a cardinal matter. The answer given by living reality will determine whether the germ of revolution sown in the entire USSR will be strengthened or undermined.

In order to consolidate what the grand insurgency had done to spread the concept of the mass revolution of the peoples, it was necessary to dispel the doubts of those who had recently become familiar with it. We had to show them that, despite all the efforts of the enemy, our revolution is not falling, but continues and develops. Therefore, we had to give them a firm belief in it, to convince them that it can and will continue, not only in the transitional military system, but also in the "peaceful" one. That Bolshevik "omnipotence" cannot stop it. Having proved this, we win many of those undecided sympathisers as active fighters.

At the turning point, at the end of the war, large-scale partisan actions and related political and revolutionary actions laid the foundations for the growth of the mass revolution of the peoples in a common anti-Bolshevik front. In the next phase, the main order of the same concept, the main task in the implementation of the same plan, is to hold on, continue and extend the revolutionary action, to use such methods and tactics as to ensure the continuity of the struggle.

The information that the UPA-UN and UGVR are active, that despite all efforts the Bolsheviks are unable to destroy the revolutionary struggle, confirms the revolutionary attitude of all neophytes, not only in Ukraine but in the USSR as a whole. However, this is not the case with the size of the existing revolutionary actions, because the effect of each action in the minds of the masses depends not only on its absolute size, strength and effort, but above all on its proportional relation to the overall situation. Amidst the enormous and shocking events of wartime, everything ordinary is lost, passes without a trace, and everything is measured by extraordinary, large standards. Only correspondingly large events and actions have an impact. It is different in peacetime, in this normal situation. Then, in a calmer environment, smaller events are also more visible, and the effect of various actions among the masses becomes greater. And in our concept

In a mass revolution, as in other sociological phenomena, the effect of an action is measured by its impact on the masses, on their consciousness and attitudes, and not by the action itself

material consequence.

The main importance lies in the very continuation of the revolutionary struggle. Every manifestation of the struggle, even the smallest, that comes to the attention of the masses has its own revolutionising influence among them. In particular, if we are talking about the masses far from the territories of the OUN-UPA's revolutionary actions, about other, allied peoples, the first impression, the first information about the Ukrainian revolution, when they became familiar with the wide-scale guerrilla actions of the UPA, dominates. Now they are wondering whether that force still exists and is active. If it does, they have a stronger belief in the revolution's vitality. The information about the existence and action of the main force of the anti-Bolshevik revolution of the peoples - the OUN-UPA - becomes a political orientation for all peoples enslaved by Bolshevism.

The successive implementation of the same revolutionary strategy in two stages can be illustrated by the following comparison: when cooking a dish, we usually turn up the heat at the beginning to bring it to a boil. And then there may be a weaker but constant fire to maintain the boil. During boiling, the temperature of the cooked food does not rise, and the dish is boiled better and better. It's the same in a revolution. Boiling is the process of maturation of a mass revolution. A strong fire at the beginning is the first stage of widespread revolutionary and guerrilla actions and the spread of the idea of a liberation revolution among the peoples. The steady, weaker fire after the boiling is the revolutionary actions of the present stage in times of peace.

The tactics of the struggle in the new phase are adjusted to the "peaceful" conditions of life in the USSR and the general situation. It is clear that it is impossible to write about it in more detail, except to touch on some points in general. Compared to the previous stage, it is marked by the use of deep underground means and greater fragmentation. Both forms of revolutionary action continue: socio-political and military. The UPA and the OUN work in close cooperation. The unity of the revolution and the coordination of the struggle are fully maintained. In accordance with the general situation, at the present stage, the front of socio-political revolutionary action is being strengthened, and the military, guerrilla and combat struggle is being conducted in such a way that, in addition to special tasks, each action has the greatest possible political and

propaganda success. The whole struggle is invariably along the lines of the implementation of the OUN's liberation concept and the formalised ideas of the entire Ukrainian people. The struggle is carried out under the banner of the UGVR, which represents Ukraine's independent statehood struggle and stands in for it before the outside world as a counterpoint to the Moscow exposition - the "government of the Ukrainian SSR".

As always, the main points of the liberation concept are dominant: the reliance on a self-determined struggle with one's own forces; the only way to liberation is the anti-Bolshevik revolution; the revolution of the broad masses of the people, with their active participation, and not of the organised forces themselves; a common anti-Bolshevik front, the liberation revolution of the peoples according to the ABN concept, in which Ukraine is at the forefront.

Along with the offensive strategy aimed at spreading the revolution to all peoples and all spheres of life, a defensive strategy is being pursued against the enemy's attempts to destroy our movement. The defence of the organised revolutionary force itself, the grounds and means of its existence and action, is also the defence of the whole people, in particular the revolutionary elements, against Bolshevik extermination.

The Bolshevik attempts to destroy the Ukrainian revolution are well underway: to break down the OUN and UPA forces with blows from the forehead, wide-ranging military and police operations, long-term sieges and blackouts; various "appeals", statements by the regime about its readiness to unite and reconcile, declarations of "amnesty", coupled with broad propaganda campaigns about the hopelessness of further struggle - to cause capitulation, sow despondency and draw away from the revolution as many of the weaker elements as possible; to break into the revolutionary ranks through provocation and sabotage, to corrupt morale, destroy leadership centres and make breaks in various parts of the OUN and UPA; to isolate the revolutionary underground from masses and their lives; to exterminate elements closest to the underground; to isolate areas saturated with revolutionary sentiment. The Bolsheviks used these methods in combination, intensifying one or the other, and changing their tactics.

But none of these methods gave the enemy the desired result. The Bolsheviks failed to destroy the revolution. The scale of Bolshevik actions against the Ukrainian underground is evidenced by the following

For example: in 1946, the Western lands were blockaded for several months with 132,000 troops. The enemy inflicted heavy blows, and the revolutionary underground suffered considerable losses, but it did not break, did not lose its main strength and ability to fight.

The defensive strategy is aimed at defending not only the organised revolutionary force itself, but also the entire population. The first priority is to defend against the threat of mass evictions.

The strength of the revolutionary underground and the unanimous revolutionary attitude of the entire population did not allow the Bolsheviks to use mass extermination and eviction of entire areas that were seized by revolutionary action and the same sentiments. The Bolsheviks had to reckon with the fact that this would have caused a general uprising in these areas, which would have been too dangerous for the regime's position within and in the face of the outside world. Thus, the strength of the revolutionary underground and the readiness of the population to fight to the death constituted the most reliable defence against the threat of mass evictions, which the Bolsheviks wanted to use in the same way as in the Crimea and the Caucasus.

The people are well aware that the existence and action of the UPA and OUN is the most certain guarantee, and their absence increases the threat. In response to the enemy's tactics, the revolutionary underground takes countermeasures. New methods of struggle have been adapted against massive military operations and long-term mass blockades. Against the enemy's attempts to limit the revolution to the "forest", political and revolutionary work, including propaganda, was intensified, the emphasis was shifted to it and insurgent combat actions were brought into line with it. The attitude of the revolutionary, political and propaganda campaign among fresh elements not yet mastered by our movement, the spread of this work to new territories and environments, including among other peoples, most successfully Bolshevik attempts to territorially limit and localise the revolutionary process.

To the question of whether the liberation struggle would survive in the most difficult conditions of the sub-Soviet reality, the region has already given a clear and unequivocal answer - yes! The revolutionary forces have already gone through the most difficult period of transition from the widespread wartime guerrilla actions to the methods of deeper underground and withstanding the concentrated pressure of the enemy. We must realise that

The Bolsheviks had already made every effort and used every method to break the Ukrainian revolution, destroy the OUN and UPA underground, and make their existence impossible. The enemy's previous efforts were not initial attempts, but only comprehensively and methodically prepared combined offensives from the outside and attempts to get to the inside, the result of several months of dense and reckless blackouts.

The OUN and UPA invented new tactics, new forms and methods of revolutionary struggle, using all previous experience and properly considering the enemy's methods. This ensures that the underground will be able to withstand the enemy's onslaught more easily and suffer fewer casualties. Obviously, the Bolsheviks will also be looking for new methods and tactics, and will "improve" their means of struggle. But their capacity and ingenuity in this regard is limited. What they have so far used against the Ukrainian revolution was not improvisation or experimentation, but only a methodical and prepared, planned application of all the experience and knowledge of Bolshevism from all time, including the last war and the Bolsheviks' own guerrilla struggle. It was the most experienced Bolshevik partisan commanders and units that formed the core of Bolshevik operations against our underground. Therefore, further changes and "improvements" on the part of the Bolsheviks could no longer be as effective as constant advances and countermeasures on the part of the revolutionary forces.

In terms of material resources, in addition to the support of a sympathetic population that tries to help in any way it can with amazing dedication, the UPA and OUN are constantly conducting offensive actions to obtain what they need from the enemy.

With regard to the threat of mass evictions of the areas covered by the strongest action, in the future, as in the past, the most certain guarantee is the maintenance of a high revolutionary potential in those areas. Not only in an effective, active form, but above all in a state of constant revolutionary combat readiness. It would not be so easy for the Bolsheviks to carry out mass evictions for the reasons that we are not talking about small territories, but only about large areas covered by the revolutionary movement, about large, even several million people. Before that, we would be talking about territories important for the military economy and for strategic communications. These are the territories of the closest backwater for the Soviet army in

Central Europe, and they are the fastest to reach the outside world. When there is a fairly strong underground of the UPA and OUN in those areas, and the population is revolutionary, ready for a desperate struggle, even if there are no loud revolutionary actions, only a potential state, then the Bolsheviks must take into account the fact that mass deportations would cause a general uprising of the revolutionary force and the entire population. This would have bad consequences for Bolshevism, both internal and external, political, economic and military.

The tense international situation is of great importance in this regard, and is useful for the threatened population. The Kremlin would like to root out not only active revolutionary forces, but all those elements of the Ukrainian and other peoples that could be dangerous to it. If it had a free hand, if the Bolsheviks' internal and external situation were not so threatening, they would try to use mass expulsions, even if this would turn large areas of Ukraine into a desert. However, the situation itself is not yet a guarantee, as it did not protect the Crimean Tatars, Chechens and others from such a fate. Only the high revolutionary potential, vigilance and combat readiness of the underground and the entire nation constitute the main guarantee and assure the proper use of the favourable general situation.

The situation and revolutionary action on the western margins of Poland must be considered separately. The struggle in those territories has the same political line and similar forms as in the motherland, but it also has its own aspect, special forms and manifestations.

The whole struggle to the west of the so-called Kerzon line (a conventional name for the line that runs through the area: Trodno-Jalivka-Nemyriv-Berestia-Dorohusk-Ustyluh, east of Hrubieszów, through Kryłów, west of Rava Ruska, east of Przemyśl up to the Carpathians, and was supposed to form the eastern border of Poland, including the border between Poland and Ukraine. The "Ker-Zon Line" was first defined by the Entente High Council on 8 December 1919. The same line was proposed in July 1920 by British Foreign Secretary D. Curzon (he is the originator of the name "line") as the border between Poland and the USSR during the Bolshevik army's offensive on Warsaw; the "Curzon Line", with amendments in favour of the USSR, was adopted as the German-Bolshevik border in the agreement between

Germany and the USSR on 28 September 1939. The last time this "line" was adopted, with amendments in favour of Poland, as the Polish-Bolshevik border was during the Yalta conference in January 1945. The territories to the west of that line were popularly called "Zakerzonnia" by the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation underground of the OUN-UPA) is conducted primarily from the perspective of protecting and defending the entire Ukrainian population against forced eviction and the terror of the Polish-Bolshevik regime, the plunder and torture of the Ukrainian population. The entire activity of the OUN and UPA on the western outskirts of Ukraine at that time was primarily focused on defending the very existence of Ukrainians in those territories, the struggle to retain their ancestral land, and opposition to Polish-Bolshevik attempts to radically eliminate Ukrainians on those outskirts.

As the enemy's terror and eviction attempts spread to the western suburbs, the self-defence insurgency is increasingly intensifying. This year (the article was written in 1947 - D.C.) it reached its highest intensity, developed into a total revolutionary struggle, engulfing the entire population. The insurgent struggle in defence of that branch of the Ukrainian people escalated into an outright war, in which the USSR and its satellites Poland and the Czechoslovak Republic (CSR) not only actually combined their military forces and conducted joint military operations against the UPA, but even concluded a formal triple pact for this purpose (the so-called Treaty of Three, signed on 28 August 1947). Treaty of the Three, signed on 28 May 1947 in Warsaw between Poland, Moscow and Czechoslovakia on joint military operations against the UPA. According to this agreement, the Bolsheviks blocked the Ukrainian-Polish border with their troops, the Czechs sent a mountain brigade to the Carpathians, and the Poles provided a motorised corps (3 divisions) and police units, which, on the orders of Marshal Roly-Zhimierzki, with the help of General Mossori and Police Minister Radkiewicz, UPA units in Zakerzonnia, throwing tanks, guns and aircraft into battle. The action was directed mainly against the Lemkivshchyna and Peremyshchyna.

At the same time, the Poles began to forcibly evict Ukrainians from their land and take some to the east, others to German lands in the west. As a result of these actions, after a long time, Ukrainian lands became deserted (at the time this article was written, the struggle had not yet been stopped) and UPA units, lacking the necessary food and connections with the population, crossed the Sian, and others raided through Czechoslovakia to

The events and development of the war of the UPA units west of the Kerzon line on three fronts are known.

agent Warsaw government, acting on directives from the Kremlin and in direct practical cooperation with the Bolsheviks, adopted a plan for the complete expulsion of Ukrainians to the USSR in 1945. Since then, enormous efforts, terror and destruction have been wrought, similar to the Tatar attacks.

Vast expanses of land turned into deserts and burning fields. If there had not been such a strong defensive action of the UPA, the Polish-Bolshevik plans would have been realised long ago. The population would not have been able to resist such terror with the most passive resistance. Only thanks to the joint heroic struggle of the entire Ukrainian population and the revolutionary forces of the UPA and OUN did the enemy's attempts to evict them to the USSR fail for so long, and the eviction to the USSR was not even 50% successful. Attempts to settle Poles in the place of Ukrainians were completely unsuccessful, as only ashes remained, and only halfway through this year the enemy managed to tear out a significant part of the Ukrainian population and scatter it to German territory.

The struggle of the Ukrainian marginal lands stands as a vivid contrast to how easily and quickly the same Sovietised Poland managed to evict far larger spaces and a larger mass of compact German population from the territories annexed to Poland that had previously belonged to Germany. This juxtaposition best reflects the Ukrainianness of the western margins, the connection of the marginal branch of the Ukrainian people with that ancestral land, its autochthonousness on that land, and then the vitality of the Ukrainian people, the readiness of each part of it to fight to the death for the basis of the nation's existence and development - for its native land.

The defence of the population of the western suburbs against forced eviction by revolutionary, armed struggle is at the same time a mediocre defence of the Ukrainian masses of other lands against such a threat. In the entire Russian imperialist tradition, one of the main ways to subjugate freedom-loving countries is to forcibly evict freedom-loving peoples from their own land, disperse them across distant lands, and impose submissive peoples in their place. Bolshevism, in its anti-national policy towards non-Russian peoples, developed this practice into the most refined system as the main means. After the war, the Bolsheviks deported Crimean Tatars, Chechens and other North Caucasian peoples to Siberia, who

proved to be irreconcilable enemies of Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism in the war.

Obviously, Bolshevism also has similar plans against Ukraine, in particular against those regions where the anti-Bolshevik attitude of the masses was most pronounced. However, the translation of these plans of Moscow is much more difficult, given the number of Ukrainian elements hostile to Bolshevism and their militancy. Therefore, the Bolshevik regime decided to act slowly in order not to cause a general disruption. First of all, it involved numerous deportations, which removed the most dangerous element from the masses. As for the wholesale eviction of larger areas, Moscow decided to take a sample first. It chose what seemed to be the easiest area - the western outskirts of Poland, fenced off from the Ukrainian mainland by a border, and isolated from the unwilling or even hostile Polish population. The uprooting of the Ukrainian population from the western suburbs was intended to be a testing ground, to give the Bolsheviks practice in how to deal with the mass eviction of the Ukrainian population of entire regions, to determine what kind of reaction we might have. In addition, the Bolsheviks wanted to eliminate the existence of a compact part of the Ukrainian people outside the USSR once and for all, and thus clearly showed that the so-called government of the Ukrainian SSR cared only about that, not about the unity of all Ukrainian lands. The expulsion was to be used to Poland's political advantage and, according to Moscow's plan, was to sow and ignite Ukrainian-Polish enmity, to make it impossible to cement a common front of Ukrainians and Poles in the fight against Moscow's common front of Ukrainians and Poles in the fight against Moscow's imperialism. These were the Kremlin's plans.

But they were overturned by the heroic struggle of an entire branch of the Ukrainian people on the western outskirts, which - as it seemed - were least capable of such unanimous military resistance. Moscow must draw conclusions from this: what would happen on the Ukrainian mainland if the entire nation rose up in a mass eviction action like this? This would be a matter of millions, of large areas, not of suburbs with hundreds of thousands of people. It would no longer be a case like the Crimeans, but a matter of a great, protracted struggle, an uprising of Ukraine, which could have incalculable consequences for the whole USSR and the overall situation.

Thus, the heroic struggle of a part of the Ukrainian people on

The revolutionary struggle in the western suburbs contributed a great deal to the defence of the entire Ukrainian nation, including the most threatened Western Lands. Although the success of that revolutionary struggle is not materially evident, this does not diminish its importance.

The lasting effect of the revolutionary struggle west of the Curzon Line is the revolutionisation of that branch of the Ukrainian people, its full involvement in the liberation struggle. The successes of the OUN and UPA in this regard are clearly too great, given that until recently these were nationally unaware, "dark", often Muscovite villages, amenable to Bolshevik influences, which turned into national strongholds, the homes of the fighters for freedom and land, for national life. If such a state of national political consciousness and revolutionary activity had been achieved throughout Ukraine and in other countries enslaved by Bolshevism, then Bolshevik imperialism, regime and system would soon have been destroyed in a short struggle, in a general uprising of the peoples enslaved by it. And the entire population of Lemkivshchyna, Posyannya, Nadbuzhzhya, Kholmshchyna and Podlasie, who once became fighters for the Ukrainian Truth, from old to young - men, women and children - would never cease to be so.

Equally those who remained on the ancestral land, as well as those who were forced out of it.

The struggle of the UPA and OUN on the western outskirts and the attacks from that base to the west are of particular importance for promoting the cause of Ukraine's liberation in the world, for publicising our liberation struggle outside the borders of the USSR, in particular in Western countries. The Western nations, as the entire outside world, have very little and only sketchy information about what is happening in the USSR. They receive information about the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other peoples mainly from our sources. Such information from those who speak in their own right, in the nature of things, is interpreted as a biased portrayal of reality, and is accepted with reservations. But of much greater importance to the outside world is the information provided by informants based on their own observations, diplomatic representatives, journalists, members of various missions, travellers, scouts, etc. In Ukraine, such guests are few and far between, and those who do get to see what the Bolsheviks are trying to hide. But in the underground, in Poland itself, in the Black Sea Region, etc.

opportunities, and the information coming from there to the outside world is scarce, but it is perceived with greater trust and interest.

There, foreign exhibitors meet directly or very closely with the Ukrainian revolutionary struggle that is being waged there, and bring that news back to their countries. Then knowledge of that small part of our struggle provides the basis for faith and knowledge of the whole Ukrainian cause, including the revolutionary struggle, with its appropriate proportions, between the western margins and the Ukrainian mainland.

The struggle west of the Curzon line, although it is a secondary front, takes first place in terms of promoting the cause of the Ukrainian liberation struggle in the international forum. In this regard, it has the greatest achievements and has done the most. This is a great merit of all the fighters of that front for the cause of liberation. The language of the facts of the struggle is the strongest argument in the international arena. And what the struggle on the western outskirts of Ukraine and the raids to the west based on that base say to the world is what the wider world knows and speaks for the entire liberation struggle of Ukraine.

A very important and respectable effect of the revolutionary actions of the UPA and OUN along the Curzon line is the spread of the concept of the revolutionary liberation struggle in a solid anti-Bolshevik front among Ukraine's western neighbours. The Poles, Slovaks, Czechs, and Magyars were directly acquainted with the actions of the UPA, the concept of liberation, the revolutionary cries of the OUN, and the mobilised common revolutionary front along the lines of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Peoples.

The activities of the OUN and UPA along the Curzon line were specifically aimed at spreading the idea of a common anti-Bolshevik front among Ukraine's western and northwestern neighbours. The aim is to instil and establish among these peoples the idea of an uncompromising, revolutionary struggle for independence, and the idea of a Common Front of the ABN. These peoples are experiencing internal political crises - a search for a way out of the situation of consistent, progressive enslavement by Bolshevik imperialism. They are largely confused at the political crossroads, wasting time and energy trying easier roads that Moscow has already torn up or cunningly directed into its net. Only a fraction of those who have been decisively chosen to take the only right path of uncompromising revolutionary struggle

peoples, while the rest are still hesitating, frightened by its difficulties. These peoples, their broad masses, need clear, living, impassioned examples and proofs that the revolutionary struggle against Bolshevism is possible and real.

Similarly, with regard to the idea of a common revolution, the confused, often despairing or sceptical leading circles and masses of our western neighbours need to come into direct contact with action on this line, to see the central force that is working to realise the concept of a common, revolutionary anti-Bolshevik front of peoples.

The activities of the UPA and the OUN had brought important results in this direction. Ukraine's neighbours and our natural allies in the anti-Bolshevik struggle have become familiar with our actions, concept, strategy and tactics. This is becoming a model for them - an example to follow and a way of orientation. The actions of the UPA and the OUN in this regard are completely unanimous. In addition to constant political and propaganda activities, the best results are achieved by the UPA's raids into foreign territories that have revolutionary and political objectives and where, alongside guerrilla operations, extensive propaganda activities are carried out. Such raids from Ukraine were carried out in all four directions to the territories of neighbours, such as Belarus and Romania. Similarly, from the western outskirts, raids were carried out in Poland, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Magyar, and most recently in the sub-Bolshevik territories of Austria. The success of the UPA's raids in spreading the revolutionary struggle and the common anti-Bolshevik front of the peoples was great.

A lot of false rumours and press reports have been spread around the recent major raids into the West. First and foremost, there is the completely erroneous interpretation that it is the UPA that is leaving its native lands. We are dealing with raid operations by several UPA units that operated west of the Curzon Line, not on their home lands. Such raids on the territories of our western neighbours take place constantly, every year. This summer, they were especially intensified due to the intensification of the struggle on the western outskirts.

As is well known, Moscow decided to exterminate the Ukrainian population on the western outskirts of Poland and to defeat the Ukrainian revolutionary forces operating there. The previous attempts in this direction by the agent Warsaw government and the Bolsheviks

Polish army, under the covert guidance of Bolshevik officers and the same complicity of the NKVD departments, were unsuccessful. Moscow has to openly take over operations against the UPA in the underground, throw large military formations into the mix and engage the mobilised armies of Poland and the Czech Republic under its command. This could no longer be done quietly, the enemy was forced to act openly, regardless of the harmful consequences for its foreign policy. The USSR, Poland, and the BSR conclude a formal agreement on joint military action against the UPA.

At the beginning of the summer of this year, the enemy launched a general offensive on three fronts. His plan was to use the armies of the USSR, Poland and the Czechoslovakia to create three large and dense front lines from the south, north and west, to lock in their triangle the UPA units and the revolutionary OUN underground of the western outskirts, to expand and eliminate them, squeezing them with three ramparts from all sides.

However, the enemy failed to achieve the intended goal of the entire offensive. In addition to the disproportionate ratio of forces, the heroism of the Ukrainian revolutionaries and the perfect guerrilla tactics of the UPA had an advantage over the enemy's efforts. The UPA's strategic plan to nullify the enemy's offensive was not to allow itself to be locked and strangled in a triangle of three fronts, but to break through it and develop offensive guerrilla actions not where the enemy would like to fight, where it has concentrated its forces, but where it is weaker and less prepared. The improvement of guerrilla tactics, the famous mastery of it by well-trained and well-equipped units of the UPA, incomparable bravery in battles, the ability to manoeuvre out of the most difficult situations, lightning-fast mobility, attacking the enemy where and when he does not expect it

- made it possible to successfully fulfil the seemingly fantastic plan of leading the revolutionary struggle on the western outskirts.

During the enemy offensive behind the Kerzon Line, UPA-West units began intensified guerrilla activity in the area east of the Kerzon Line. By doing so, they largely tied up the Bolshevik forces that were assigned to attack and supply, and thus drew the UPA behind the Kerzon line, weakening the Bolshevik southern front. Significant forces of the UPA and the OUN militant underground, behind the Kerzon line, broke through the enemy fronts in many areas and, according to the plan, went on raids. They deployed extensive guerrilla

actions, operating with rapid mobility in areas outside the concentration of enemy forces. As a result, they forced the enemy to disperse its forces over wide areas where UPA units raided and could raid. Having far greater communication and technical capabilities, Bolshevik units, and even less so Polish and Czech ones, cannot match the mobility of the UPA's raiding units. Therefore, they could not use the tactics of a quick pursuit. And attempts to encircle and lock up the raiders do not look likely to succeed if those units managed to escape from the triangle of three fronts. Therefore, the enemy had to move to stationing fragmented military units throughout the entire territories "threatened" by UPA raids in order to fight UPA units where they appeared, and not to compromise with the population that Ukrainian revolutionaries freely appeared and conducted their military and propaganda work, while pro-Moscow government troops of the country did not even show up.

Thus, the raids on the entire deep interior of the enemy fronts drew away significant forces of the Probol-Shevik Polish and Czech armies, weakened the enemy offensive on the western outskirts, and struck a major blow to the triple alliance.

From the broken triangle behind the Curzon line, raids were launched to the north and north-east - to Poland and Belarus, to the west and south-west, to the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Magyarshchyna, and Austria. The main part of the raiding units did not completely detach themselves from the bases of the revolutionary movement in their native lands, but relied on them, making closer or further attacks. Some units went on long raids, breaking away from the random bases and main forces. They reached the western borders of the Bolshevik zone in Central Europe. Some of those units and some groups, in the aftermath of the hostilities, moved to neutral ground.

In addition to military and combat , the UPA's raids on foreign countries had political and propaganda goals, which are now in the forefront.

The success in spreading the anti-Bolshevik revolutionary struggle and the concept of the ABN's common front among other nations is a lasting success of our struggle, a further, important step towards victory. And the recent UPA raids, particularly in the West, have done a lot in this direction.

Thus, of the great offence that the USSR and its satellites Poland and

The Chesnaks wanted to defeat and destroy the Ukrainian revolutionary forces on the western outskirts, and the UPA's extensive controlling actions - large raids - not only saved the insurgent revolutionary forces from destruction, but also brought significant successes to the Ukrainian revolution.

As we can see, the entire revolutionary, political and military struggle of the UPA and OUN is conducted in a planned manner in every situation, on all territories. It is consistent with the implementation of our liberation concept. Knowing this concept, one can see in all actions a consistent translation of one plan. All actions are not only about the immediate, material effect, but first and foremost about the continuation and expansion of the revolutionary struggle, the mobilisation of more and more new forces, more and more masses and the joining of other peoples to the common anti-Bolshevik front. All efforts, labour and sacrifices that contribute to this development and growth of the liberation revolution are justified, because they lead to victory in the only right way.

## **A word to Ukrainian nationalist revolutionaries abroad**

*This article, signed by Stepan A. Bandera, appeared as a separate brochure as a publication of the OUN media in July 1948, on 69 pages. Excerpts from "Slovo" were published under the title: "Stepan Bandera about the UNRada" in the weekly "Mas", Fürth, in 1948; in chaps. 10, 11 and 13 of the socio-political fortnightly "Liberation Path", London, 1948. I, October, November and December 1948; excerpt from the article "The only real liberation concept" in the weekly "The Future of Ukraine", Toronto, ed. Xii, no. 42/596, 15.10.1960; under the heading "First and foremost - independence and sovereignty" in the journal "Liberation Way", year of publication. XI/XVII, no. 10/240, October 1964; in Yaroslav Stetsko, "Since June 1941", Political Library of the Liberation League of Ukraine, vol. 26, Toronto, Canada, 1967, pp. 327-329.*

*A review of "The Word" signed with the cryptic M. (M. Mironenko) appeared in the section "Bibliography and Criticism" of the journal "Liberation Politics", Munich, year of publication IV, part 1/10, 1949, pp. 56-59.*

*The reason for writing "Slovo" is explained by its author: "All the inequalities in political thought and attitude in our ranks are largely due to the lack of exchange of ideas and clarification of problems to the very basics. The purpose of this letter is to provide clarification to all nationalist revolutionaries abroad..."*

*In these explanations, the author of Slovo will clarify what the OUN and its programme are, what alliances of states and peoples can be, the concept of our own forces, point out the isarchy of our tasks, give practical advice on implementing the liberation line in our domestic policy, and emphasise the main tasks of the Ukrainian emigration - to capitalise on the struggle of the Ukrainian people in foreign policy.*

*Relatively little space is also devoted to the affairs of the Ukrainian National Council and the expediency of cooperation with other political environments.*

**Friends Nationalist Revolutionaries!**

**Our entire political activity abroad must be a planned and consistent implementation of our revolutionary liberation policy in**

A land that leads to a single goal. We must constantly check the correctness of the paths and methods of our policy on the basis of the results, direct them and improve them. The success of the entire foreign activity of the nationalist movement depends to a large extent on whether all its constituent elements are unanimously and in the same way directed towards the same goal, whether all its participants have the same guidance and the same understanding of the main issues. With this in mind, I am addressing you with this "Word" to share my thoughts with you and to contribute to the fact that the main problems of Ukrainian politics will be clearly understood in our ranks, and our positions, principles and main lines of our political activity abroad will be clearly crystallised. I do not intend to clarify the entirety of our political activity abroad, but only to raise some issues that now require complete clarity, or those around which disagreements or confused views arise. At the same time, I have to recall the main goals and principles of our movement, which, like a compass, determine our path in every situation and which must always be kept in mind when it comes to the question of the correctness of our policy.

## *I.*

The Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists (Revolutionaries) is a liberation political organisation that differs significantly from all Ukrainian political parties in its nature, goals, ideological content and activities. It does not become a spokesperson for the interests of any particular part of the people, does not derive its goals and programme from any abstract, theoretical socio-political programme, its main task and dedication is the struggle for the liberation of Ukraine, the struggle for an Independent, Unified Ukrainian State, which alone can ensure the Ukrainian people's full freedom, comprehensive free development, welfare, social justice and true democracy. When this goal is achieved, the rationale for the OUN's existence and the content of its activities will be further sacrificial service to Ukraine through dedicated work and creative struggle for the best development and achievements of the Ukrainian people in all spheres of life, for the prosperity and greatness of the Ukrainian State, and the fight against everything that stands in the way. The OUN fights for the good of the entire Ukrainian people and all citizens

Ukraine, not any one part, social stratum, etc. The OUN derives its programme from the needs of the entire Ukrainian people, from its nature and historical development, from its current state, from its life aspirations and guidelines in the struggle for the highest comprehensive development, well-being and self-expression of the people - the whole and all its components, the nation and the Ukrainian person. The distinctive life and development of the Ukrainian people are harmoniously combined with universal progress as its constituent, creative part.

The Ukrainian people will be able to live and develop freely only when they are freed from the oppression and exploitation of Russian-Bolshevik imperialism, when they get rid of all enslavement and become masters of their own land, in an Independent, Unified Ukrainian State. Liberation and an independent state are the question of whether the Ukrainian people will be able to live and develop freely, to contribute their creative values to the development of humanity, or whether they will become dung for the further growth of retrograde Russian-Bolshevik imperialism, which brings enslavement, want, and decline to all mankind. The Ukrainian nationalist liberation movement puts the struggle for the restoration and consolidation of the Sovereign Unified Ukrainian State at the heart of all Ukrainian life. Concentrating all forces and all actions to achieve this highest goal, it sets before the Ukrainian people a specific content of the Ukrainian state, namely, that it unites the whole nation, all Ukrainian lands, that it is ruled by the sovereign will of the whole Ukrainian people, guaranteeing comprehensive freedom, justice, equality, welfare, free development and free creative activity to all citizens of Ukraine without distinction.

Regarding the form of the Ukrainian state, the OUN at this stage does not consistently advocate any established structure or name, leaving this issue for the time of state-building, when the Ukrainian people will decide it with their free will. This has been the position of the OUN from the beginning of its activities to the present day, and it has been adopted by the UHHRU in its patriotic form. Such a guideline is politically expedient.

In modern times, the organisational form of the state itself does not yet determine or reflect its actual content. What we are witnessing is that in some states with the same form of government, whether republican-democratic or monarchical, rule of the people, freedom, justice and prosperity prevail, while in others

totalitarian tyranny, terror, oppression, lawlessness and the blackest exploitation. After all, the USSR, a state - a total concentration camp, a state of the worst tyranny, dictatorship and slavery - boasts of its "most democratic" form of government, it is only the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". There is not even a sole head of state, there are councils, colleges, collectives, presidiums everywhere. And at the same time, in some monarchies, for example, in the Scandinavian countries, we see the essence of democracy.

Now that each state form has a different content, why should the question of structure and name divide and distinguish independent forces, diverting attention and energy from the struggle for content?

We do not deny the greedy organisational form in which the correct content of Ukrainian statehood is embedded, and we do not enter into disputes over this. On our banners, our movement inscribes the very content of Ukrainian statehood, which cannot be replaced by a greedy form, and not a form-structure that could contain different content.

We are confident that the Ukrainian people will not stop the uncompromising struggle for their sovereign and united state until this goal is fully realised, nor will they allow it to be replaced by empty, meaningless forms or half-way solutions, in the form of a federation, unions, etc. The disaster of 1917 cannot happen again, when the federalist concept confused the construction of Ukrainian statehood, stunned the healthy national and political institution of the people and disarmed it in the face of Bolshevik intrigue and offensive. A similar disease cannot survive in Ukrainian politics today, in its old or new form, as new anti-independence federalist, unionist, universalist tendencies. They emerge as opportunistic phenomena in the wake of the pursuit of "new, modern" goals and ways of Ukrainian politics, with the inability to distinguish between lasting developmental trends in international life and temporary, opportunistic situations.

We do not intend to oppose interstate unions, blocs or associations. They are useful and finite in international life. Ukraine will surely enter into alliances or blocs with other states on the basis of common interests, and through its active participation in broad interstate associations it will be able to contribute creatively to peaceful

coexistence and co-operation among the free nations of the world. When sovereign states come together as equals, for common purposes that benefit all participants, without preference or privilege for one nation over another, without exploitation or oppression, this does not violate the independence or free development of any people. All states united in a broader or narrower union decide and regulate their common interests jointly, in a common forum. This does not violate the principles of national and state sovereignty when all peoples and states enter such a bloc, association, etc. voluntarily, freely and equally. When everyone is equally interested in it, equally benefits from it, and no nation violates the sovereignty of another nation.

Such alliances are possible only between free, sovereign and non-imperialist nations, on the basis of common, identical goals and interests. There can be no genuine alliance with a nation that aims at the enslavement, subjugation or exploitation of other nations and, for this purpose, falsely enters into an "alliance" or wants to use it to unilaterally strengthen its position, pursuing goals that are harmful or undesirable to the other contracting nations. There must be full mutual recognition, respect for rights and interests between the states that are members of an association.

Interstate associations of various types and sizes built on such principles can be a factor of progress in international life, positive for all nations. But only on such principles. We have to distinguish between correct, healthy, progressive associations and retrograde, destructive and unviable ones.

Let us compare the unification of Western European states with the Soviet Eastern European bloc. On the one hand, the Western European states, which are in the same geopolitical position, have a similar economic structure and situation, are united as equals to protect their common interests in several areas, including political, economic, defence and military. The alliance is healthy and beneficial for all participants. On the other hand, the union imposed by the Bolshevik empire on the satellite so-called states, against the real will and interests of these peoples, is an instrument of Bolshevik exploitation, subjugation and harnessing of these peoples to Moscow's further imperialist and aggressive plans. Or the second example: what kind of union can there be between the USSR and other

states, when the USSR is consistently striving to overthrow their system, impose the communist system on them through the penetration of communism, coups and aggression, and incorporate them into the world communist union? This is clearly proclaimed in the communist programme, the official state doctrine of the USSR. Moscow has not renounced this anywhere, it is consistently moving towards it. Everyone knows and sees this - and they are creating the United Nations together!

Ukraine can enter such interstate entities built on sound foundations, in which it will be an equal participant, and its rights and vital interests will be respected and secured.

The main and indispensable prerequisite is Ukraine's state independence. The first step is to gain and consolidate an independent, united Ukrainian state, and only then will Ukraine's , full participation in international associations be possible. Any "concepts" that Ukraine can join international, supranational structures as an equal member without its own independent state and that the struggle for a state may be unnecessary are harmful to the Ukrainian people.

The main goal and the most important principle of all Ukrainian policy is and must be the restoration of the USSR by eliminating Bolshevik enslavement and dismembering the Russian Empire into independent national states. Only then can there be room for the unification of these independent nation-states into blocs or unions, based on the principles of geopolitical, economic, defence, cultural and developmental common interests, as outlined above. The concepts of evolutionary restructuring or transformation of the USSR into a union of free states, but also linked, in the same composition, to the superiority or central position of Russia - such concepts are opposed to the idea of Ukraine's liberation, and they must be completely eliminated from Ukrainian politics.

The Ukrainian people can only achieve an independent state through their own struggle and labour. The favourable development of the international situation can contribute to a new development and success of our liberation struggle, but it can only play a supporting, though very useful, role. Without the Ukrainian people's own struggle, the most favourable situations will never give us state independence, except for the change of one enslavement to another. Russia, with its deep-rooted and, in the modern era, most fervent invasive imperialism, is in every situation, in every condition,

will rush at Ukraine with all its might and ferocity to keep it within its empire or enslave it anew Both the liberation and defence of Ukraine's independence can be based only on Ukraine's own forces, its own struggle and constant readiness for self-defence.

We also need to have as many and as good allies in our liberation struggle as possible, and above all, real ones. And Ukraine can have them. But only when it fights and when it is strong. Because alliance is a relationship of reciprocity. It can be enjoyed by those who give and receive something. We would probably never get liberators, "liberators" who would win freedom for us and give it to us. Our allies are, first and foremost, those nations that have been enslaved by Russian-Bolshevik imperialism and are fighting against it for their lives and freedom, and are favourably disposed towards Ukraine's independence and unity. And then, when it comes to a confrontation between the USSR and still free nations, these latter can be our allies. This will depend, among other things, on how much our struggle and our forces will matter in a military conflict.

The concept of one's own struggle, one's own struggle, by one's own means, is the only real liberation concept. It is the only one that can be the content of Ukrainian independence politics and the guiding principle of all political action.

## //

The internal Ukrainian policy of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists is and must always be liberationist, not party-based. That is, it strives to form such an internal Ukrainian life, to create such a way of life and relations between Ukrainian forces that, in any situation, are most useful for the liberation struggle, and not only for strengthening the positions of the OUN itself. Our attitude to all other Ukrainian political currents, concepts and organised forces is always normalised according to their programmatic and practical attitude to the current struggle.

The role that they already play or can play in the current liberation political action is crucial. Rivalry in the ideological and programmatic plane, defending their own conceptual

The development of positions, their dissemination among the general public in contrast to the positions of other ideological and programmatic directions should be carried out in its own way. But the actual relationship of forces must be normalised in accordance with the actual policy being pursued. Intergroup rivalry cannot solve everything and be in the foreground, making it impossible to concentrate all forces in a unanimous liberation action.

In our political action, we put the consistent conduct of the liberation struggle and the unswerving implementation of the main line of the liberation concept in the first place. We never deviate from this, in any situation. At the same time, we make every effort to ensure that the whole nation, both the broad masses of the people and, if possible, all organised political factors, follow this path of effective liberation policy, so that a solid liberation front unites everyone. If it is possible to get everyone on the right path of liberation, then we must make every effort to do so and put aside secondary or less urgent matters that stand in the way of creating one common front. The principle of the greatest consolidation of the liberation front and the concentration of all available forces in it comes before the principle of our own political interests.

However, in such a situation; when other political factors - organisations, centres, parties, all or some of them - are unwilling or unable to follow the most difficult path of uncompromising liberation struggle and politics, retreat from it, or take the path of passivity, then the liberation movement, the OUN, cannot look back at them and must compete on its own direct path of struggle without them, or even against them. For the sake of mechanical unity, so that there are no differences and divisions in Ukrainian political life, we cannot deviate from our liberation concept, stop our uncompromising struggle against the enemies of Ukrainian state independence, or take the path of those who withdraw from the struggle, seek reconciliation with the enemy, or choose the line of passivity. In the most difficult historical moments, those forces that are capable of doing so must keep the front and the banner of uncompromising struggle against the enemy.

After all, the posture of various organised political factors does not yet reflect the posture of the masses. In our reality, political organisations and parties cover a very wide range of

a small part of the people. The broad masses of the people show their guidance by direct participation in political actions, by their support, indifference or dislike of the initiatives of individual organised political environments. Sometimes the vast majority of the people, the entire activist community, can follow one movement, while other groups can remain alone. Therefore, in our actions, we pay attention primarily to the masses, activate them, join them in our actions and struggles, and rely on them, because only the active participation of the masses can give the liberation movement the momentum it needs to win.

But in political life, the very existence of political trends, centres and groups that stand outside the front of the struggle or are opposed to it also plays a role. This allows the enemy and opponents to divert the proportional power relationship and portray the case in such a way that the liberation revolutionary front is isolated, separated, and a significant part of the political forces oppose it. The outside world usually has little recognition of our reality, cannot look closely at the actual situation, and is only guided by the signs of Ukrainian political life. It can be reduced to deception, portraying Ukrainian reality falsely, to the detriment of the liberation front.

Therefore, our efforts must always be measured to the extent that, in addition to mobilising actual strength in the liberation front, we must link all Ukrainian political factors to it, so that in the main issues of liberation the Ukrainian political world appears to the outside world as a united whole. This should be based on the same concept of an independent policy. But it is also important to address the issue of political representation and general political consolidation.

The OUN consistently implemented these basic principles and directions of our policy. At different stages of the OUN's activity, there were different conditions for the liberation policy, different external circumstances and internal Ukrainian relations. In these different conditions, the same basic political line was implemented in terms of the finality and expediency of the liberation struggle.

But the position and role of various Ukrainian political groups and their relationship to our consistent, straightforward policy was not so stable, and went through various evolutions. So our attitude to

he whole internal Ukrainian political system was presented differently in different phases. To those who look at the matter superficially, it may seem that we have changed the line of our domestic policy. This misconception stems not only from the fact that only the external image is perceived. Some people think that a principled domestic policy should be normalised by firmly established attitudes towards particular political environments, because they do not seem to be aware of the principles of our liberation policy.

In order to point out the practical implementation of a consistent liberation line in our domestic policy, we will highlight some of the moments in our activities since 1941, in particular those that have been subject to many confusing interpretations.

In the spring of 1941, on the eve of the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, Hitler's plans for Ukraine became apparent: to lure people with vague cries and promises, to harness them to his imperialist cart, and then to turn Ukraine into a territory of colonisation, economic exploitation, and a source of slave labour.

Initially, during the war, Berlin tried to play the deceitful game - on the one hand, promising statehood, and on the other, using the war situation, Ukrainian unpreparedness, . One of the main arguments of Hitler's deceitful policy was the accusation that Ukrainians were unprepared, united, quarreling, had no one to talk to, etc. At the same time, they were playing each other off against each other, preventing any understanding. At that time, the need of the hour for all Ukrainian political factors on the western outskirts and in emigration in Europe to come to an understanding, to create a united front and a consolidated centre of representation. This requirement of the situation was well understood by all Ukrainian political factors, and on the initiative of the revolutionary OUN, the Ukrainian National Committee (UNC) was established in Krakow, which included representatives of all but one or two of the environments, centres and groups. The OUN took the initiative and made every effort to carry out a consolidation action, guided primarily by the rationale of the current liberation policy, and not by its opposing attitude to the programmatically different groups that the OUN was fighting. Other accomplices had the same goal.

As for the UNC, we can hear accusations that it was not faithful to the partners of the agreement, that the Act of

June did not come from the UNC, which continued to act separately, and the UNC was not activated. However, this accusation does not stand up to scrutiny when one considers the substance of the case. The UNC was formed on the basis of open, legal action and, because of this, could not be a revolutionary factor, as it would have been immediately eliminated by the occupier. The UNC was not prepared to start or lead a revolutionary struggle against Germany.

He was to formalise and manifest the unanimity of Ukrainian politics, to be a spokesman for Ukrainian independence aspirations within the framework of normal political action, not revolutionary steps and struggle. The act of restoration of the Ukrainian state on June 4, 1941, and the state-building it initiated were revolutionary actions, and it was known in advance that Hitler would respond to them with unrestrained repression. It was inexpedient and impossible to involve the UNK in this. For the mere transmission of the radio message about the ZO Act by the UNK Committee. 6. 1941, members of the UNK were imprisoned by the Gestapo.

If there were a possibility of normal independent political action, Germany respected the state sovereignty of Ukraine and its non-interference in Germany's war against the Western powers, these unshakable principles of Ukrainian independent policy, then the UNC would have entered the field of broad political action and representation. Wherever possible, the UNC was activated and its significance was raised accordingly. The Ukrainian National Rada was established in Lviv in July 1941 in connection with the UNC; similarly, at all mass popular gatherings and demonstrations throughout the territory, the UNC as the centre of all-Ukrainian political consolidation was emphasised. The further development of events was such that there was no room for the UNC to act as a legal independent centre. Only political works and actions that adapted to this reality could exist in the Rising reality; however, those who were uncompromising and wanted to take action had to go underground.

Similarly, with regard to the Act of June 1941 and subsequent events, the main points need to be highlighted in order to eliminate various false interpretations, consciously or unconsciously spread, which are harmful to Ukrainian politics.

The revolutionary leadership of the OUN decided to take the following attitude

of the liberation cause in connection with the German-Bolshevik war in a planned manner, after comprehensive consideration. It was clear that Hitler's Germany had no intention of taking a positive attitude to the cause of Ukrainian state independence, and on the other hand, it did not want to immediately provoke the Ukrainian people to fight against it. By using vague policies, tactics of non-binding promises and delays, and by maintaining hopes for Ukraine's state independence after the end or resolution of the war with the USSR, the Nazi regime planned to prevent the Ukrainian people's desire for state independence from being resolutely directed against Germany. Berlin did not want to have Ukraine against it, it tried to involve it first of all in its war against the USSR and thus link it to its entire policy, deprive it of the possibility of conducting an independent Ukrainian policy, use and largely exhaust Ukraine's forces in the war, and then we know what fate Hitler was preparing for Ukraine.

It was clear that in relation to Hitler's Germany, one not hope for successful negotiations, demands, persuasion, etc. Such measures were condemned to failure in advance and could only be used as tactical measures to hold such trump cards and to conceal preparations for action on another line. The real independent . the policy had to follow the path of accompli, of its own initiative, without looking back at German policy, and if necessary, clearly against it. At the beginning of the new situation created by the military events on its lands, the Ukrainian people had to speak out clearly and decisively, to create their own life according to their own will, their own decisions. And so it happened. The proclamation by the People's Assembly in Lviv of the restoration of the Ukrainian state, the establishment of the Provisional State Government, the holding of a national plebiscite in the form of an expression of the will of the people at mass open demonstration meetings throughout the Ukrainian territory free of Bolshevik occupation, the development of state building in all sectors - all this was accomplished by the will and own efforts of the Ukrainian people, despite the wishes and attitudes of the Germans, against their will.

We are deeply convinced that the honour of the nation, historical and political finitude dictated that we should so. We had no hope that such complete facts and the resolute will of the Ukrainian people, so manifested, would change Hitler's political plans against Ukraine, their

Nothing could change the situation at all. But only decisive and complete actions on our part could create a clear situation, cross out the most dangerous Hitler's insidious plans for Ukraine and keep an open, clear path for further independent liberation policy. These actions were, first and foremost, a clear expression of the will of the Ukrainian people that they decide on their own, that they always struggle to restore their sovereign state, and that the relationship between Ukraine and outside forces depends on their respect for the sovereign rights of the Ukrainian people and the liberation of their sovereign state. From these positions, Ukraine never retreats, in any situation, and does not renounce its natural rights to state sovereignty even under the pressure of the most powerful outside forces.

These state-building acts were crucial for directing and crystallising the main internal political processes that had been taking place among the Ukrainian people as a whole since the summer of 1941. The cause of Ukrainian statehood could have been lost or silenced among the enormous struggles of world powers. June 1941 prevented this from happening and placed it at the centre of political development amidst the military storm in Eastern Europe.

The main line of Hitler's deceitful and insidious policy against Ukraine was crossed. At first, the Germans were still trying to turn it around and keep it, hoping for a lot from its success. That is why they did not act immediately with their usual recklessness, but tried to eliminate the matter quietly, to hush it up, to push it aside. When it became apparent that this was not possible due to the resolute and expressive Ukrainian attitude, German politics was forced to reveal its cards, to show its true attitude and plans. German repressions and a course of openly hostile and occupying policy opened everyone's eyes, exposed the essence of German "Ostpolitik" and created distinct fronts.

Some people claim that during the Act of June 1941, phrases and gestures were used that were friendly to Germany. It is time to speak out in this matter, because our truth is clear and pure, and we must stop the false portrayal of reality. We have always defended the independence of Ukrainian politics, which is guided only by the Ukrainian radio, and not by flirting (unsuccessfully!) with outside forces.

There is a question about the main line of Ukrainian policy during the last war, in particular against Germany. Germany's war with

by other states, as long as it did not affect Ukraine, demanded that we remain completely neutral. Ukraine had been enslaved by Bolshevik Russia and, in its struggle with it for its original existence and state sovereignty, had neither the opportunity nor the right to interfere in any way in the affairs of another country's war. When, at the turn of 1939-1940, German attempts were made on the western outskirts and in Poland to draw Ukrainians into the war in the West and recruit them into special military units assigned to the Western front. The organisation and all Ukrainians reacted strongly against this. It went unnoticed because it was a low-profile affair, but it marked an important political decision.

When Germany went to war against Russia, our enemy, Ukraine could not accept this fact in a negative way. But this did not resolve the issue of relations between Ukraine and Germany. It had to depend on one thing: how Germany would treat Ukraine's state sovereignty, whether it would respect Ukrainian sovereignty and Ukrainian interests, whether it would seek an ally in Ukraine against Bolshevik Russia, or whether it would treat Ukraine as a military prey and an object of its goals. Ukrainian independence policy could not be guided by the fact that Hitler's Germany was like this or that, so we were immediately against it. We had to take a stand and did take a stand for the independent realisation of our national goals, the defence of our rights and interests. And then Germany had to have its say. When such a profound decision, agreement or struggle between Ukraine and Germany was to be resolved, only essential, big issues mattered, not minor or distant moments for us. And one more thing: if there was to be a struggle between us in such a situation, it had to be unprovoked and clearly caused by Germany by trampling on the rights and will of the Ukrainian people. Therefore, our line of action was clear: the unrelenting defence of the cause of state independence, and, under the condition of respect for it, readiness for friendly relations and a joint war against Bolshevik Russia, and only against it.

We consider this political line to be the only correct one, we have outlined it, implemented it and defended it with heavy sacrifices - and we always admit to it. We believe that history will fully approve of it. And the outside political world must also objectively recognise our rightness and respect our position.

And we face another accusation: why did the OUN come to the forefront of the restoration of statehood in 1941, why did it clearly state its initiative and put its members in prominent positions in the reviving state life? Those looking for material for accusations see it as ambition, lust for power, a race to keep someone from getting ahead of us, etc., rather than seeing what was clearly manifested in reality. So, three issues were crucial here: the issue of the plank itself, the issue of responsibility, and the issue of maintaining the positions taken.

Everything that was done in June-July 1941 could only have been carried out in a revolutionary manner, by taking the Germans by surprise, by very quick and decisive action. This could and should have been prepared and organised by the OUN itself. If the case had been directed towards a joint, inter-organisational action, the Testapo would have paralysed it in advance.

It was foreseen in advance that the Germans would be hostile, use reckless repression, try to force a retreat, cancellation, etc. And so it happened. From the very beginning of the imprisonment of members of the State Board and part of the OUN leadership, representatives of the German government tried by all means to persuade the State Board to abolish or dissolve itself. Representatives of Rosenberg assured that the German government was not against state independence, but that it should wait, and that everything should be concentrated on the defeat of the USSR, offered broad cooperation with Ukrainians, gave a two-year period for the gradual introduction of state independence for Ukraine, etc. When such promises could not induce the cancellation of the acts, ultimatum demands came next, with threats of reprisals against the Organisation and the entire nation, as in an enemy country. And finally, as you know, it came to the use of these threats.

In preparing for the restoration of an independent Ukrainian state against the will of Germany, such a development was foreseen and German repression was taken into account. So it was a question of who, which political factor would be responsible, with all the consequences. It was necessary to come forward with an open helmet. When it was not possible to defend Ukrainian statehood with weapons in this situation, it was imperative that those who led it did not hide in any way and did not renounce it under any pressure. The revolutionary OUN believed that it had to take over

responsibility and duty to defend the right and will of the Ukrainian people before the world and the enemy. That is why the Act of 30 June itself clearly recorded the initiative of the OUN, and the State Board was headed by a member of the OUN leadership. Everything was done in such a way that the responsibility was concentrated on the Organisation, and subsequently all the enemy's repressions against the Ukrainian state fell on the OUN, which was hardened and prepared for the struggle, and not on other Ukrainian political factors.

At that time, the OUN had to take the lead. Other political factors were ready to follow this path until it came to an inevitable, outright conflict with Germany. They were inclined to a different political tactic, not to take matters to the sword's edge - to passive resistance rather than active, decisive action in that situation, at the beginning of the German-Bolshevik war. At the beginning of the struggle on two fronts, the OUN could not count on the complicity of other organised political environments. The situation was such there no way for such factors and organisations that wanted to stand for Ukraine's state independence to act legally. And the underground, revolutionary methods of action, apart from the nationalist movement, did not correspond to other environments. They gradually ceased to manifest themselves as active political factors. What remained on the surface was "politicised" public life in the forms that the German occupation allowed and into which many forces were poured. And independent political life was concentrated in the nationalist underground, which was simultaneously fighting against the Germans and Bolshevik Russia.

The Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council was created at a time when the revolutionary liberation struggle, which was launched and organised by the OUN, had gained the widest dimensions as a struggle of the whole nation. The ranks of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army included all those who, regardless of their political beliefs, were ready for an armed liberation struggle against the occupying enemy. Political parties did not exist at that time. So there was no one to conspire with. The independent, revolutionary actions in the areas of greatest activity went far beyond the political and military operations of the organised revolutionary forces of the UPA and OUN themselves. In their content and forms, they actually developed into an underground state life, which actually

of the occupied territories covered various areas, from political, administrative, social and economic to schooling inclusive. The broadest masses of the people, the entire population, took an active part in it, and the system of the enemy occupation administration was largely paralysed, isolated, compressed to military and administrative centres, from which the enemy made only attacks. The enemy occupation and state system was opposed not only by the revolutionary liberation struggle, but also by an active, independent underground state formation that expressed and embodied the will of the Ukrainian people, and its liberation army, the UPA. The UGVR emerged as the supreme body of this formation and the governing centre of the national liberation struggle.

The main role of the in the entire Ukrainian liberation policy is that the UHHR was created, is located and operates in the Ukrainian lands as the highest revolutionary governing body in the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people, in contrast to the occupation and agent works of the "Reich Commissariat", "Governor-General's District" and "Government of the Ukrainian SSR". The point is precisely this opposition to enemy exhibitions on Ukrainian lands. Thus, the main acts of the UHHR clearly state that the UHHR is located in Ukraine. Acting the native lands as the supreme body of the revolutionary liberation struggle of the people, the UHHR gives it a national character, it is led not only by the revolutionary liberation organised forces of the OUN and UPA, but also by the whole nation with one national revolutionary body at its head.

In order for the UHHRU to have such a character, the basis of its construction is the principle of representation of all independent political environments, unification and coordination of their actions. These principles of uniting all independent forces, concentration and coordination of the whole independent action are the foundations without which the UHHRU could not justify its recognition. They remain unchanged and in any situation must be applied in such a way as to find the fullest possible implementation. In the circumstances of the time, when only the nationalist-revolutionary environment was active, and other political trends were not active, the principle of individual selection to the UHHR was adopted, so that, in addition to the existing revolutionary forces, other trends could be defended, at least by their individual recognisers. In those

conditions, it was the only way to implement this principle, and its application proves the maximum attempt to fully implement the principle of involving all forces and all environments. Obviously, in conditions where there are other political environments that recognise the revolutionary concept, as is the case in exile, their unification in the UGVR must be realised in a normal and authorised manner - through participation and representation in the UGVR on the principle of organisation. This is the essential focus of the main acts of the UHHRU, to the maximum extent possible in each situation.

During the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people, as in every revolution, all independent groups must have two main, closely related goals: the overthrow of the existing state of enslavement and the creation of a new one - the restoration of a sovereign Ukrainian state. The basis for the division into different political currents is, on the one hand, differences in the liberation path, and, on the other hand, differences in the content and structure of the Ukrainian state. If several political groups recognise that the only way to liberation is the revolutionary path, then, regardless of the differences in views on the future forms and system of state life, their participation and cooperation in the social leadership centre of the revolutionary struggle becomes a given.

The emergence of the UHHR stemmed from the needs of the liberation struggle and was completed for the sake of a broader, more complete attitude of liberation politics and the fight against enemies, rather than for the sake of internal Ukrainian politics. In particular, it would be wrong to attribute to the UHHR a tendency to gain power for itself or an attempt to pre-determine the structure and relationship of Ukrainian political forces. In the course of the revolutionary liberation struggle, the UHHR played the role of the Ukrainian revolutionary authorities in the native lands. This stems from the revolutionary process itself and meets the current needs of Ukrainian independence politics. However, this is not an end in itself, and there is no tendency to turn the UHHR into a normal state body. With the restoration of a sovereign Ukrainian state and the calling of ordinary state power by the Ukrainian people, the purpose of the UHUR will end. The UGVR was created because there was and is a need for such a supreme body-centre that would act before the Ukrainian people and the whole world as the highest and most responsible leader of the immediate revolutionary liberation struggle.

The UGVR is opposed on Ukrainian soil to the "government of the Ukrainian SSR" as an exposition of the Russian-Bolshevik empire, not to any Ukrainian factor. There can be no "competition" between the UHHR and other Ukrainian political factors, because there was and is no such centre that would take on the tasks and responsibilities that the UHHR took on. In relation to the internal Ukrainian political life, the creation of the UHHR and its platform give expression to the idea that not only does it take into account the existence of different political environments, but it also meets their active independent activity and leaves room for them to participate in the conduct and management of the revolutionary liberation struggle.



Next, let's focus on the general line of our current domestic Ukrainian policy abroad.

In order to determine the correct path for our actions in the internal Ukrainian political life abroad, we must first of all bear in mind the clearly defined, most important tasks against the liberation cause, which must be solved not only by our Organisation, but by the entire Ukrainian political emigration. And then there is the question of what kind of force structure and internal organisation in the current situation would make it easiest to accomplish the main tasks.

Ours is the era of the Ukrainian nation's struggle for life itself, for freedom and for the foundations of further development. In Ukraine, there is a struggle of the whole nation, in all spheres of life. There is a unanimous national liberation front of all forces, all components of the irreconcilable Ukrainian people, standing against the Russian-Bolshevik imperialist oppression. It is engaged in an active revolutionary struggle, social, political and military, which is being waged by the UPA and the OUN in close cooperation with each other. The front of the struggle covers all areas of life, all strata of the people. It involves every person who, in his or her daily life in the totalitarian Soviet system, acts consciously to support and strengthen Ukrainian distinctive life and Ukrainian forces, nullifying the hostile, anti-national schemes and plans of Russian Bolshevism. Alongside the underground revolutionary and insurgent, the Ukrainian independence front is held by the Ukrainian clergyman, scientist, artist, intellectual, worker and peasant - everyone who

In its area, in its segment, it defends Ukrainian content, Ukrainian idea, Ukrainian interest against the all-consuming total Russian Sovietisation of life, country, people and nation. At all points of the national struggle, in all its forms, the Ukrainian nation has laid down hecatombs of victims, its best children. But not in vain.

They have so far been able to defend the spirit of the Ukrainian nation and Ukrainian content against the enemy's attempts to fill Ukrainian forms with Soviet content. Bolshevik Moscow is forced to make concessions, at least in form and in the state and political sphere. Ukraine became only the material prey of Bolshevik imperialism. But it did not cease to be its most persistent, formidable enemy, irreconcilable and untamed. In all countries under the Russian-Bolshevik rule, the process of liberation revolution of the enslaved peoples is developing rapidly, and Ukraine is at the forefront of it.

The organised political and military struggle, led by the UGVR and waged by the UPA and OUN, with the active participation and support of the entire nation, plays the role of the first line and main bastion in the entire independent, anti-Bolshevik front. It most clearly presents the Ukrainian liberation struggle to the entire outside world and to other post-Soviet peoples. It contributes most to the growth of the common anti-Bolshevik liberation front of peoples and raises the importance of the Ukrainian struggle for international development. Today's active struggle creates a real, solid basis for the entire Ukrainian policy of independence. It is bought with huge sacrifices every minute, but what it brings to the cause of Ukraine's liberation is no less great - it is finite. The point is not to waste these precious achievements of the modern struggle, but to consolidate them and make the best use of them in foreign political action.

Here we come to the definition of the main tasks of all Ukrainians in foreign lands in opposition to the liberation cause. The entire Ukrainian nation, including all political activists, must be a spokesperson for the struggling Ukraine to the outside world. The main task is to disseminate among all peoples true information about Ukraine's struggle, its ideological positions and role in the defence of all mankind, its advance and freedom against Bolshevism. To spread proper understanding and correct assessment

Ukrainian liberation struggle, so that all nations would be sympathetic to the real Ukrainian cause and would be encouraged to appreciate its real importance for international development. As a consequence, we need to gain real and active allies and helpers who will support the Ukrainian liberation struggle in various ways - morally, politically - in the international forum, as well as practically.

Ensure that the struggle of Ukraine and other nations in a common liberation front against Russian-Bolshevik imperialism plays an important role in international relations, in accordance with its actual but not properly revealed significance.

When the unanimously active Ukrainian political emigration properly contributes to such foreign policy capitalisation of the liberation struggle in the native lands, to the correct presentation of the Ukrainian cause in international politics, and to the effective and useful attitude of outside forces to our struggle, it will fulfil its duty to the homeland.

Obviously, emigration has other tasks as well. To nurture and develop Ukrainian values in various spheres of life, including that had no place in the sub-Bolshevik reality. To educate and train personnel in a foreign country for full participation in the liberation struggle and state-building. To train professional forces for armed struggle and liberation political work. The emigration faces many other tasks. But here we will touch upon only one set of basic obligations against the struggle in the homeland - foreign political ones, which are of great importance for the success of the liberation struggle and which can only be fulfilled by Ukrainians abroad. These are the most inherent tasks of emigration, which the whole of Ukraine expects to fulfil.

We have objective data and favourable conditions for their implementation. First of all, we have something to show the world. Ukraine's modern liberation struggle against Bolshevism, in particular the existence and actions of the UPA, provide the best material to clarify Ukraine's role in the modern world and convince foreigners of its importance. Furthermore, the threat to the world posed by Russian-Bolshevik imperialism and the growing awareness of it among all nations creates fertile ground for our activities. The entire emigration has truly respectable forces to fulfil its foreign policy mission. The older forces, already familiar with foreign soil, are joined by new ones, fresh from the homeland, who can

to give full meaning to comprehensive political and informational activities in a foreign world, meaning that is relevant to the current state and level of Ukrainian life and the Ukrainian struggle. The activities of revolutionary, nationalist activists, their direct participation in foreign political work, should act as a driving force, giving all Ukrainian political action abroad a high level of intensity and dynamics. Finally, the material side.

The long-settled and economically strong emigration in the Americas could easily finance a broad and high-level foreign policy campaign. If only the funds that emigrants overseas contribute to various national goals were returned to the country, then the job could be done properly. These resources are dispersed in a fragmented manner, without a planned economy, spent without effect, and the most important matters of proper independent foreign work remain in unacceptable neglect, among other things, due to lack of material means and capabilities. So, in summary, even if only briefly, we come to the conclusion that there are appropriate conditions and capacities for the wide deployment and proper staging of the main independent political action abroad.

And now let us answer the question: what has been done so far? What have we and the entire emigration done in three years? What the proportion of the achievements of the Ukrainian independence movement to the struggle in the homeland during this time? Not only its results, but the very efforts, endeavours, and attempts?

It is with regret, with a sense of unsatisfactory fulfilment of obligations, that we must state that too little has been done and accomplished. The foreign political action is far behind and owes a great debt the current struggle in Ukraine. It is not justified when we take into account the sum of capacities for its proper implementation that the entire Ukrainian emigration possesses or can possess.

It is not enough to respond to the grandiose revolutionary struggle of an entire nation, to the heroic actions of the UPA, to be proud of them, to be their representatives. All this obliges. It is necessary to give an account of what everyone did in a foreign country for the liberation cause. Where are the major political actions of all Ukrainians abroad in front of the outside world that should speak on behalf of Ukraine at war? Where are our political missions in different countries, missions, delegations, information bureaus, what is their

activities, how many performances? How many of our editions, publications in foreign languages, proclaiming the truth about Ukraine and its struggle to the world? How many memorials, responses to foreign political circles were there?

In their homeland, the fighters and the entire nation hope that the current emigration, including nationalist activists, will make every effort to launch an appropriate independent political action abroad, commensurate with the struggle at home. They hope that the whole world is now well aware of Ukraine's struggle and has won the favour of many nations.

It will not help to justify the lack of activity and small successes by listing obstacles, referring to one's good will and efforts, or pointing to the fault of others. The Ukrainian cause will not be made any easier by showing who is to blame, or by making everyone silent in solidarity and complaining about the difficulties in the same tone. There is no way to hide or conceal the fact that in such a difficult and important time, in a time of unprecedented struggle in the modern world, Ukraine's large and capable political emigration, and all the factors operating among them, failed to properly launch a corresponding foreign political action. The fact remains that there is a great need for such an action, the emigration as a whole could have launched it, there are those who could have, there could have been means and ways, but it was not done. The responsibility and guilt falls on the entire Ukrainian community abroad. Responsibility falls on each factor insofar as it puts itself in such a role that it entails obligations to take initiative, leadership and active work. And then - to the extent that each has the actual ability and disposition to do so. But for whom is it more important that the foreign action be staged in the best possible way, in accordance with the struggle at home, who should be more pained by its neglect, who should feel the greatest actual responsibility, without regard to the formal side of the matter, if not the foreign part of the nationalist, revolutionary movement? Let everyone justify themselves as they wish, but for the OUN, for its members and all those who feel inextricably linked to the liberation struggle in Ukraine and its fighters, there can be no formal justification for them until they have done everything possible to ensure that the case is put right. We need to put all our efforts into it.

forces, to use all means, to try all ways and means, to subordinate all minor or now insignificant moments to the important cause - only then can we say: "We have done everything that was possible and in our power".

What is the meaning of such language? The meaning that every nationalist revolutionary must speak with the strongest voice of a sense of duty to the liberation cause, to his or her friends fighting in their native lands. Duty to action, to change. Having realised that independent political action abroad, including domestic political action, is of great importance for the liberation struggle and that this action is not going well, one must tell oneself resolutely: things cannot go on like this. We need to make changes, we need to fix things. We must eliminate the main reasons that lead to such a weakening of Ukrainian independent political action abroad, reasons that are rooted in the internal political life of the Ukrainian emigration.

The first major disaster is that in our life, if we take it as a whole, too much energy, effort, attention and time are consumed by internal fronts, hostility, and mutual struggles between different political environments. If this were happening in other times, in other circumstances, in our own country, it might not be so tragic. Or if this internal enmity was a derivative of the struggle against the enemy, stemming from unequal, opposite attitudes towards him. If internal jokes and clashes were the main concepts of Ukrainian politics. Meanwhile, the lion's share of the current internal struggle in exile is essentially reduced to group rivalry, meaningless competition, the continuation of old disputes that had significant political content in the past but are no longer relevant, or the defence of some abstract socio-political doctrines that are detached from live political activity. How much energy, zeal, and stubbornness is now invested in mutual struggle in emigration! It often pushes into the background, overshadows the essential work of Ukrainian liberation and the fight against the enemy itself. If that energy, that enthusiasm, and those means were returned to the anti-Bolshevik front, to unanimous independent action abroad, then there would certainly be something to mark the role of today's emigration.

The second disease of Ukrainian political activity abroad is

is that all the negatives of the internal Ukrainian divisions and enmity are transferred to the foreign policy action and give it their own imprint. There is no unanimity in this action, there are several centres, and often some factors discredit others in the eyes of external factors. Instead of concentrating on one goal, to achieve the best possible position for the entire Ukrainian cause, foreign policy work is often conducted from the angle of gaining positions for itself, undermining the positions of other Ukrainian factors, or even paralysing their actions, without regard to the damage to the integrity of the whole. The rivalry of Ukrainian political centres, groups and stations abroad in front of the outside world, mutual recitation and denial, disqualify Ukrainian politics as a whole and cause great damage. Thus, the great achievements of a difficult foreign policy campaign are squandered on the foreign front, and the Ukrainian emigration, which is supposed to be Ukraine's spokesperson abroad, represents internal squabbles and irresponsible attitudes to group interests over national ones to the outside world.

A way out must be found. Intergroup struggle must stop dominating Ukrainian political life in exile.

Political energy, attention and activity should be concentrated on essential liberation causes - in the fight against the enemy of Ukraine and in independent foreign policy actions. This must involve unity, solidarity and cooperation of all forces and political factors. Internal political differentiation and rivalry must be kept within such limits as not to harm the unanimous struggle and action abroad. The whole life and activities of the Ukrainian emigration must be marked by what the liberation cause now demands: the concentration of all forces and energy on the independent, liberation front and the unity of the independent action.

The previous developments have clearly shown that, in isolation, no political factor can properly launch and stage an independent foreign policy action abroad in the way required by the state of the liberation struggle. And our camp could not and cannot satisfactorily solve this main task. Suffice it to review the results of the entire activity of the UHHR's Foreign Representation, not to mention the sporadic attempts of other factors that made much less effort. The results of the activities to date prove that

in this way, in this way, it is impossible to do what objectively can and should be done. It is necessary to bring together all the separate and even opposing actions that have been carried out so far and concentrate the greatest possible effort in one joint action.

When we speak of the finality of political consolidation in exile, we do not mean mechanical consolidation, which is limited to the creation of an intergroup or supragroup centre, without agreeing on its tasks and basic political line. Only mechanical consolidation works usually turn out to be incapable of a respectable action, and when such an action is, all internal political contradictions come to light. Only such consolidation can be of real value, which is based on only one main political concept and is measured to the fulfilment of agreed fundamental tasks.

A purely mechanical unification can be a stepping stone to a full-fledged effective consolidation, although it is better that the underlying political agreement underpins the consolidation work from the outset. But this is a matter of method and should not be an obstacle to agreement.

In its foreign activities since the end of the war, the OUN has defended the concept of organic consolidation of Ukrainian political forces in foreign countries. We advocated consolidation on the platform of the UGVR, because it immediately gave a clear political face and action the consolidation action. The UHHR platform and organisational base would most clearly express the fact that all consolidated forces take the position of the liberation concept that relies on the Ukrainian people's own liberation struggle and through this struggle is realised, that the whole of Ukrainian politics is based on the primacy of the struggle in the native lands. Adopting this concept of consolidation, we have outlined appropriate projects of political and organisational order adapted to Ukrainian political life abroad. According to those plans, the corresponding foreign body of the UHHR was to be built on the principles of unification, active participation and group patronage of existing independent political groups. The foreign structure of the UHHR should have taken into account and positively interpreted the fact that there are various political groups in foreign countries and that there are opportunities for freer political activity. The principle of group participation and the patronage of organised political and social factors makes it quite

possible complicity and co-responsibility of the existing political and public environments. This concept was tested by the highest ranking members of the UGVR and OUN in their native lands.

However, these plans and the concept of consolidation have not been implemented abroad, despite our constant efforts over the past two years. We will not discuss the developments in this case here.

The fact remains that other political environments that exist or have existed in exile have not reacted positively to the UHHR, do not participate in it, do not support it, and are mostly opposed to it, both internally and externally. This situation has a harmful effect on our foreign independence campaign. The reality of emigration serves as an illustration and argument for the tendentiously false statement that the positions and struggle of the liberation and revolutionary movement are separate and isolated in Ukrainian political life. This exposes and diminishes the true state of the liberation cause. Our opponents are trying to characterise Ukrainian political reality abroad in a superficial way, as if the revolutionary OUN is the only one among many political environments that recognises the UHHRU and defends its position as a leading and representative centre, while all others stand outside it and against it. This creates an argument for the accusation that the OUN and the entire movement mono-partisan and totalitarian. Never mind that this is not true, and that the OUN has always advocated the concept of participation in the UHHR of other active independent groups.

Our concept of complete consolidation of the existing independent political forces abroad on the basis of the UHHR has no greater prospects for implementation in the current reality than in the previous, more favourable internal situation. Instead, there is a real opportunity to unite on the basis of the UHHRU with those independent political organisations that declare that they stand for the revolutionary liberation struggle, in particular with the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists-Solidarists led by Andriy Melnyk. In this way, it would be possible to bring about a situation where all existing political organisations abroad that recognise the revolutionary liberation concept would take the position of a single revolutionary liberation centre and unanimously defend the liberation policy based on the revolutionary struggle in the Motherland. This is

would have led to a significant strengthening of the positions of the revolutionary liberation front abroad, to the intensification and success of its activities, and would have given its mark to the whole development of Ukrainian political life abroad. It is easy to estimate how much stronger the foreign action of the revolutionary liberation camp would have been if those who have so far shown the most energy and activity in the struggle for our political activity had taken part in it. The Organisation has taken steps to bring the foreign actions of the liberation front to an understanding at this stage and thus to consolidate them in accordance with the state and requirements of the struggle in the Motherland. Whether this initiative will come to a successful conclusion depends on the other party and, to a large extent, on the UHHR Foreign Representation.

Over the past year, a consolidation initiative has been launched on the platform of the newly created *National Council*. This concept was recognised by the majority of political organisations and parties in exile, which began to implement it. The leadership of the OUN's foreign units decided to send a delegation to participate in the work of the Preparatory Commission for the establishment of the Ukrainian National Council. By its resolution of 5 April this year, the Leadership of the ZC adopted a platform on which the OUN (r) is ready to join the National Council. The content of the resolution from 5. iv. is as follows:

"1. The Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists declares its readiness to join the Ukrainian National Council in exile, despite the fact that so far the OUN and other political groups that are members of the Ukrainian National Council have not reached an agreement on Ukrainian liberation policy. The OUN will compete for the correctness of this liberation policy and its implementation in the forum of the Ukrainian National Council.

2. The OUN (r) will recognise the reformed, renewed and developed on a broad political and public base, in accordance the current demands of Ukrainian liberation, the only State Centre of the Ukrainian People's Republic in exile, with all the prerogatives that arise from this definition.
3. The decisions of the OUN (r), referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this resolution, are based on the fact that the State Centre of the Ukrainian People's Republic recognises the Ukrainian Main Liberation Council (UHLR) as the leading revolutionary body that emerged in

in the struggle against the German and Moscow occupiers in 1944 in the Native Lands on the initiative of the UPA, and that the UHHR reserves these tasks for the governing body of the struggle until the goal of establishing an Independent, Unified Ukrainian State is fully achieved.

4. The issue of establishing relations between the centre of the Ukrainian People's Republic and the Ukrainian Main Liberation Council belongs to the competent authorities of both sides."

This platform is implemented by the OUN (r) delegation to the Ukrainian National Council or the Preparatory Commission.

The OSCE's approach to consolidation on the platform of the National Council and to Ukrainian politics in general differs significantly from that of other Ukrainian political actors. The latter often look primarily at the legal and formal side, searching for the essence in the formal constructions themselves, as if this is how the cause of Ukrainian liberation should be resolved. Instead, we, aiming at the true restoration of a sovereign Ukrainian state, know that it is possible only through the continuous, concentrated struggle of the entire Ukrainian people. Therefore, we interpret all the creations and constructions in Ukrainian political life from the point of view of an effective liberation policy, since they can be its suitable factors, drivers, since they lead to the concentration of forces in the independent activity, directing it to the right path.

When there is a positive assessment in this regard, formal matters come second.

In our opinion, for an independent political action abroad, it is necessary that the consolidation be based on a clear liberation concept and that this be reflected in the design of the foreign centre itself. However, we have to draw conclusions from the fact that our concept of consolidation abroad has not been realised so far, and that the National Council, if properly structured and directed in the right way, can play a positive role in the independence policy abroad. We should positively evaluate and support the efforts of those factors that compete to make the National Council an effective factor in a serious and correct independent political action abroad. Even though there are

very negative trends, a sad remembrance of narrow party doctrinaire and egoism, many of the same evils that led to the decline of Ukrainian statehood in the 18th and 20th centuries, often represented by the same party groups. In general, the construction of the National Council at the present stage is a construction of mechanical consolidation, in which the competition for the direction and outlined content of political action is only developing. This is still the creation of a form that must be filled with actionable content. It can be useful for independent politics or vice versa, depending on the content of its work.

In accordance with this situation, the Organisation takes its position, its main direction is as follows: to take an active part, to make every effort to direct the National Council on the path of such development and activity that will make it a healthy, positive factor in the liberation struggle, and to prevent it from being led down the wrong path, harmful to the liberation cause. We are taking part in the National Council with the knowledge that our refusal to participate in it would push the development of the cause in a direction harmful to the independence campaign abroad and would deprive us of the opportunity to fight for the determination of the correct political content of that political centre. Our efforts in this direction must be counted on to be permanent and consistent.

If we had not taken part in the National Council, the development of internal Ukrainian life in exile would have been completely divided into two opposing camps. Having neither sufficient representation of the revolutionary liberation movement nor any relation to the liberation struggle, and being in the position of an opposing camp, such a National Rada, by the force of reaction, would have taken the path of negating them, diminishing their role and importance in the liberation of Ukraine. Such an arrangement would determine the action of two separate, opposing foreign actions, to the detriment of the whole. The actions of such a National Council and the whole camp would always have the character of competition with the liberation revolutionary camp, its denial or operation with political fictions, pretending that there are other revolutionary forces that stand on the positions of the State Centre of the UPR, which also has its own revolutionary front. It would be inappropriate for us to contribute to such a development by our non-participation,

unhelpful for the integrity of the independence policy.

We are starting the National Council with the aim of bringing the whole Ukrainian independence policy to unanimity. The National Council is emerging as a foreign political centre, and its activities will be manifested in foreign, primarily foreign policy actions. We must try to ensure that this action follows the line of an independent liberation policy, that it is unanimous with the liberation struggle in Ukraine, that it is relied upon, that its importance is raised, and that we try to gain support for it. The creation of the National Council was based on the principle of legality of its actions. But without deviating from this principle, the National Council can have a clearly positive attitude to the struggle waged by its own order in the native lands, can base its policy on the fact of the existence of this struggle, and can serve it. There is no contradiction in this. But for this to happen, there must be appropriate spokespersons in the National Council. What is even more important is that there should be no opposition and enmity between the liberation and revolutionary movement and the National Council, and that they should be fundamentally united by the same independent policy.

When it comes to the relationship between the UHHR and the UNRada, there is no contradiction in their simultaneous existence and activity. The National Council cannot assume the role and purpose of the UGVR Council, the revolutionary centre in the Native Lands, nor can it perform the functions inherent in the UGVR - to lead the revolutionary liberation struggle in Ukraine as its governing and representative body. The National Council and the entire exile State Centre, having taken a position of liberation policy, do not in any way interfere with the UGVR in its inherent functions. In its turn, the UHHR did not assume the role of a traditional state centre that derives its legitimacy from the state legal acts of 1918-20, does not act in this sense and on this plane, and did not deny the possibility of such a factor relying on state legitimacy by any act. These are two formations of a different nature, resting on a different basis, with a different nature of activity. In action, there can be no overlap between them. Instead, the activities of the one and the other factor should be mutually complementary, reinforce each other and, following the same general line of Ukrainian liberation policy, create a harmonious whole together. We are of the opinion that there may be

formal connection between them, and at the appropriate stage of the liberation struggle, the issue of complete unification may be relevant. But this is not important now, and there is no need to argue about it. The main thing is that both centres stand on the same fundamental positions of the independent policy, that both implement it in their activities, that both sides understand the usefulness of the other factor, mutual recognition, and readiness for mutual support and cooperation.

If the National Rada denied the rationale for the existence and activities of the UHHR, and had a negative attitude towards it - despite its undoubted finality and expediency for the liberation struggle - this would be a manifestation of neglect of the liberation cause and would condemn the National Rada before the Ukrainian people. This opposition cannot have a political basis if the National Rada sticks to the path of a correct independent liberation policy. We want to believe that this will be the case and we will take care of it.

However, there is a danger of contradictions between the National Council and the UHHRU Foreign Mission due to empty, meaningless rivalry for reasons of "power struggle", and above all, over purely theoretical issues of priority, prerogatives, etc. This threat is quite real, it stems from the chronic disease of Ukrainian life, when various Ukrainian factors define their character, their positions and prerogatives on paper, and then, instead of engaging in the real activities to which these self-definitions oblige them, they "fundamentally" fight for a place, for abstract prerogatives with other Ukrainian factors that affect them, or engage in such activities. This disease is corroding Ukrainian political life, and the lack of serious independent political activity is being filled by the noise of internal struggles over insignificant things. Unfortunately, conflicts between the UHHRU Foreign Mission and the National Council Commission over "prerogatives" and "seniority" have already begun to emerge. Regrettable as it is, we certainly assess such unhealthy manifestations for what they are in essence in order to slow down further development along these lines. This is a harmful and compromising phenomenon in Ukrainian political life abroad in such a difficult situation. We have to call out: gentlemen, come to your senses! Let's fight for a sovereign state, let's do our best, and let's not argue about who is "more sovereign". In the Ukrainian state, the Ukrainian people themselves will be sovereign and

will establish its form, name and government. And now we must fight the enemy, the Russian-Bolshevik enslavement, and oppose it with all our strength, in all areas, in all possible forms. We must put everything at the service of the liberation cause: the revolutionary struggle in the Native Lands as the main front, the basis of liberation, and the legitimacy and action of the exile state centre. If we direct all our attention to our own independent action, we will see that there is room not only for some, but for all, we will feel the need to fill all fronts, we will see that the action of the second factor, which is now considered a competitor, is also necessary and finite.

It is a sad manifestation of the fact that some Ukrainian politicians continue to fight for power, for prerogatives, for ministerial and other titles and portfolios, even though they are empty. But we cannot allow this same disease to creep into our environment. It is one thing to defend the sovereignty of the Ukrainian independent factor in opposition to the enemy's exposition, to act as a full-fledged spokesperson for Ukraine before the world and to use accepted state forms and names, to defend their legitimacy before the enemy, and it is another thing to start an internal Ukrainian struggle against this background, to make cooperation and all work impossible. There is no effective opposition between the UHHR or the UHHR ZP and the National Council or the Exile State Centre, and it cannot be invoked by theoretical formal definitions. Only in foreign political activity could conflicts arise between the National Council or the Exodus Body of the State Centre and the UHHR or its Foreign Representation. But they will not arise when both factors pursue the same independent policy and are guided by the liberation cause.

The fundamental line of foreign policy of both factors should be the same. The division in its practical implementation will be regulated by the different nature of the two institutions. The foreign policy activities of the National Council or the Fossil Body, their scope, content and form in each case will be determined, on the one hand, by the nature of the exile state centre, and, on the other hand, by the basis of legal action.

The National Council, or its Fossil Body, in view of its legality, cannot act as a factor responsible for the revolutionary and liberation struggle in the Native Lands and speak directly from it, although

will be able to refer to it and talk about it. A legally operating centre will not be able to carry out some foreign, foreign policy actions and speeches that are necessary for Ukrainian independent policy, but are possible for a factor that assumes responsibility for the revolutionary liberation struggle in Ukraine, speaks directly on its behalf and is not bound by the restrictions that follow from the rules of legal action. This is precisely what should define the activities of the UHHRU's Foreign Mission. Instead, there is no need for the UHHRU Foreign Mission to carry out such activities, engage in such affairs and actions as are set by the National Council or the State Centre's Executing Body.

By focusing on its inherent tasks, Representative Office will be able to solve them better.

The issue of competences and prerogatives can only lead to disputes and conflicts in the abstract and theoretical formulation. In the plane of political action, it is simply resolved in each case by the different political nature of the two institutions, the unequal quality and capabilities of their action.

Everything depends primarily on goodwill; regardless of the formal relationship, there must be mutual understanding and cooperation. The issue of sovereignty cannot be a matter of dispute at all. Sovereignty belongs only to the Ukrainian people, not to any centre. Actions on its behalf have only a conditional value: everything that is in line with the will of the Ukrainian people, which most certainly leads to the realisation of its main goal - a sovereign united state - will be accepted and legitimised by the Ukrainian people. Everything that is contrary to this will be rejected and condemned.

What comes first, not who. What action, what content, what result

- This is more important than the question of which factor is at work. In such a situation as ours, during the total struggle for the existence or non-existence of a nation, the correctness of a political action determines its legitimacy. What is usually called the legal authorisation of a factor to rule and decide is essentially an obligation to act, and to act correctly. It can never authorise actions that are harmful to the nation. If it is not implemented, it wastes power.

When it comes to the question of the legal authority to make commitments on behalf of Ukraine, none of the existing political factors has it in their hands, in the normal sense. None

The political factor should decide, impose and accept obligations only within the circle of those organised assemblies, that part of the people from whom it has directly and indisputably received authority to do so. When it becomes necessary for the liberation cause to make temporary decisions or commitments on behalf of the whole people, then in each case it should be a joint decision of authorised representatives from the widest possible circle of organised groups.

The OUN, by joining the National Council, does not change its attitude towards the UHHR. It continues to recognise the position and role played by the UHHR in Ukrainian independence politics and the liberation struggle, and fully supports it. Knowing that there is no effective conflict between the UHHR and the National Council or the exiled State Centre, the Organisation recognises the need and expediency of mutual recognition, understanding and coordination of actions between both centres in the name of the liberation cause. There must be not only a formal willingness, but also genuine goodwill on both sides. The rationale of liberation politics, that which unites and is useful for the cause, must be put in the first place. The unification of all independent forces, the coordination of all political activities for liberation - these are the basic principles that underlie the creation of the UHHRU. The UHHR accepted this as one of its main tasks, but not as its monopoly. A negative attitude to the consolidation process is alien to the spirit and basic principles of the UGVR. It is erroneous and harmful for the UHHRU Council and the entire revolutionary liberation formation to portray the UHHRU in such a light as if the UHHRU were fighting for so-called prerogatives, monopolising the right to political representation or hindering the consolidation of political forces abroad.

Our domestic policy cannot be limited to declarations and be satisfied with the fact that everything seems to be in order, when in the meantime everything remains the same, all energy is spent on the internal struggle, when there is no longer time or energy for the fight against the enemy and for independent political action. We must really do everything possible, reject unimportant things, give in to more than one thing that is only relevant to our own positions and not harmful to the liberation cause, in order to improve the situation, to free Ukrainian energy abroad from internal self-exhaustion, and direct it to where it can serve Ukraine and its liberation. This should hurt us the most, we

We have to take the most care. We have a responsibility to those who are struggling. We can only be justified if we really can't do anything. We should not decide in advance that things cannot be improved - we must prove it. To do this, we need to use our capabilities and influence. For the cause of eliminating internal fronts, of uniting all forces for an independent action and liberation struggle is right and final, it is determined by the whole nation, and the emigrant community has a healthy sense of its need. We must appeal to the general public, to the Ukrainian patriot. We have to stand guard over this cause and serve it sincerely. To show the right path, not to allow it to be nullified, distorted or used for group selfish purposes. If someone wants to do this, we have to fight them. We are counting not only on ourselves, on our actions, but on the position of the healthy emigrant community, an entire political asset. Its resolute stance will make it impossible for any speculation and sabotage to take place, if such manifestations are clearly tarnished and addressed to the public. So, there is a way, there is a force, the force of public opinion, to force everyone to act in the cause of consolidation in a pure and sincere way.

We do not intend to be passive and silently cover up any of the consolidation process, no matter who does it. There is already a lot that distorts the matter at its very core. We regret to see attempts to turn the forum of the National Council or the Preparatory Commission into an arena of group-personal combinations, an instrument of personal political aspirations of individuals. We are alarmed by the attempts of those who have taken the initiative and the reins of affairs into their own hands to address the issue of building the National Council from the angle of their own party interests, rather than from the perspective of the practicalities and requirements of an independent policy. For this purpose, a bizarre constitution of sectors is invented and imposed, contrary to the principles of democracy and the requirements of efficiency. The purpose of this is clearly shown: the Socialist Association, the weakest of the emigrant political creations, which has no influence among the citizenship, has not conducted and is not conducting any political activity, should be in the first place in the National Council, with the most seats!

We do not agree in any way with the anti-democratic principles of the design of the National Council, which completely disregards, ignores and does not give any place to opinion and will of the general public. To.

According to the initiators of the National Council, only political organisations and parties are the bearers and expressors of the state and political aspirations of the Ukrainian people in foreign countries, and only they have the right to decide on Ukrainian policy. And all of them have an equal say, with an equal voice, whether their positions, activities and views are shared by the majority of Ukrainian society or not, as well as those that do not have the slightest support. The position and opinion of the broader emigrant community cannot be defended in the National Council.

A few units that proclaim themselves to be some kind of, for example, socialist party with an appendix, without any obligations, without any activity, referring to the former existence of such a party, must be protected in the National Council by a high percentage of members. Thousands of active citizens cannot have any, even indirect, patronage. This is all done only to secure seats for themselves, for their party friends, and out of fear that citizenship will not come to a vote. For what other reason?

We do not agree with such principles and practices in the creation of the National Council abroad. We advocate building a consolidation centre on sound principles, on the basis of democracy. The spokesperson and implementer of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people is a whole political active emigration abroad. Only a small part of it is united in political organisations and parties, while the general public takes part in political actions. It represents the will of the people, and it must be expressed and taken into account. We are against group control and dictatorship. We hold the view that members of the National Council should be elected by the entire political emigration. We know that, with good will, such elections can be held in all emigration centres, if not directly, then indirectly, and political organisations can nominate their candidates everywhere and win the votes of citizenship for them. If the initiators believe that this is too complicated and would too long to form the National Council, then a temporary procedure for delegations from political organisations and central public institutions can be adopted. The representation of political organisations and parties should be at least in some rough numerical proportion to their activities and to the extent to which they have influence and approval among the general public. The separation of parties from citizenship, their isolation and lack of any influence on society and

The lack of public control over them is a manifestation of an unhealthy state, and building the National Council on it is a system of oligarchy, not democracy. We are against such a system. Political organisations and parties must be controlled by the general public in the way that they operate among them and make their positions known to them, and the masses of the public approve or reject them by their participation or non-participation in their actions, by their support, more or less, in political and social life, and above all, in the most direct form - elections.

In the current situation, the most correct principle for creating a governing and representative political centre in a foreign country is that all politically active emigration is a foreign representation, an implementer of the struggle and will of the Ukrainian people, and it creates such a centre and gives it mandates.

Disagreeing with the anomalies and selfish party combinations that manifest themselves in the very foundations of the National Council, the Organisation tries to bring about change and correction. However, it does not put things in such a way that if its position does not go through at the present stage, it refuses to participate. We do not do this primarily so that the National Council does not follow the line of wrongdoing and opposition to the policy of the liberation movement. Similarly, it is inappropriate for the Organisation to provoke hatred for the fact that consolidation cannot be completed because of its refusal. It is inappropriate to expose the Organisation to accusations that it is fighting for its own positions, for mandates, and when its demands are not accepted, it rejects the entire institution. That is why the OUN participates in the National Council, despite the aforementioned incorrect principles of its current design.

Instead, it will consistently strive to change and rebuild the National Council on sound principles of democracy. It will do this in the forum of the National Council, addressing public opinion and the situation of the entire citizenship, and will insist with all determination on the introduction of sound principles for building a state and political centre in exile.

But in the first place we must always put the affairs of independent policy, make every effort to ensure that the National Council stands on the right positions and conducts such foreign political work that meets the modern requirements of the liberation

The National Council of Ukraine will take all necessary measures to ensure that the competition is properly promoted and used in the international forum. We will take all necessary measures to ensure that such political activity of the National Council is properly implemented. Our attitude to the National Council and the Fossil Authority will depend on it at any given moment. When its activities are correct and useful for the liberation, the OUN will fully support them, without regard to internal affairs. When issues of the political concept and actions of the National Council are being considered, we must make every effort and take all measures to ensure that it is on the right path. We will actively and resolutely fight for this in its forum and elsewhere, if it is appropriate. If the National Council, or its subordinate bodies, were to take the path of a wrong policy that was contrary to the goals or needs of the liberation struggle, then we would strongly oppose it and fight against it. If any factor played a harmful role against the policy of independence, then we would have to make sure that it was removed from Ukrainian political life.

But as long as this situation does not exist, we must use our positive attitude to prevent this from happening. It would be wrong to say that the very design of the National Council, its composition, and the well-known political attitude of the majority of its members predetermine its opportunistic rather than liberationist policy. In political life, we must stand on the basis of real facts, not assumptions or conjecture, and the political line of a formation must be seen as the resultant sum of many factors, not just the result of the subjective attitudes of the actors.

The political line of the National Council will be shaped not only by the political thinking, orientation, sympathies, appointments, etc of the subjective data of the arrhythmic majority of its members. It will be influenced, if not decisively, by a number of political factors independent of and stronger than the composition of the National Council. These will be factors from the Ukrainian political reality and external ones. These include: the state of the liberation struggle in the homeland, the clear ideological and political orientation of the majority of the Ukrainian people, the general state of emigration, its political development and relevance, the crystallised position of the activists and the broad masses of emigration in current political issues,

political actions among the emigrants, the activity and influence of our movement and other political environments, and many other data of Ukrainian reality. And alongside this, the general, international political situation, the position of the Ukrainian cause in international politics, the attitude of individual external forces to Ukraine, to individual Ukrainian forces, actions, etc. All this will influence the National Council and its policy. And when it comes to our chances of influencing it, we must take into account and properly use all the ways available to us: indirect influence through the masses; and through our activities outside the National Council, in particular through the power of the struggle at home, and not just through the voice of our representatives in the National Council itself.

As mentioned earlier, the National Council is only being created, and its political face will continue to be shaped. So now, in fact, there is nothing to show our attitude to, except to the very fact of the emergence of a consolidating political centre that will only gain political content. Our assessment and conclusions have already been made. Our practical attitude to the National Council, i.e. the position of our representation in its forum and in opposition to it before the whole society, will always be normalised in accordance with its policy and activities.

In addition to the consolidation of political forces and their concentration in an independent action, there is a need for one responsible centre. We see its creation as a positive development for the entire emigrant life. It assumes not only the right to lead and represent, but above all the responsibility for the condition, development and activities of the entire emigration. This responsibility and duty of leadership will no longer "hang in the air" and fall on the shoulders of the most active environment by force of circumstance, but will be concentrated in the Executive Committee of the National Council. And there it will be distributed to all participants, to each environment in the proportion as it is numerically represented there.

We will strongly and unapologetically insist that the National Council and its Executive Body fulfil their tasks well and exercise the prerogatives for which they began to fight even before their formal establishment, and that all the environments involved, including those that are at the forefront, occupying the most seats and leadership positions, also contribute proportionately

Labour. Participation in the Executive Committee of the National Council cannot be what the ministerial portfolios of the UPR's emigrant government were before. It must be a real reorganisation and renewal in terms of the content of work, composition, and not just form. And its activities will be visible to the entire citizenry, under its control.

We sincerely intend not only to take responsibility and fulfil it properly, but also to take a good look and tell the public about each environment, not just in the race for mandates, posts and titles, but in terms of work. This is a reciprocal right, and everyone else can evaluate our work in the same way. Different political environments and units that have not been noticed in any work or independent action are in a position where either they will really work, and do it right, and then it will be beneficial for the common cause, or their deception will be revealed and they will finally compromise themselves in the eyes of Ukrainian society.

We do not think of throwing logs under the feet of someone who, having the necessary qualifications, takes responsibility and wants to work sincerely, honestly and serve a good cause. In our lives, including in our foreign political activities, there is a lot of work to be done, and there are too few hands and heads. However, we do not think about letting things go back to the way they were and keeping silent about irresponsibility and idleness. And competition in work will improve our lives in the best way, give us a natural selection of forces, and clearly show who is worth what.

We distinguish between participation in the National Council, which is a longer-term institution, and participation in the Executive Committee, is a body that has to conduct practical and political activities and, of course, changes its structure and composition more often. It has the task of organising all activities, managing them and being responsible for them. Therefore, its structure and composition must be fully adapted to the current needs of the liberation struggle, to the actual tasks of foreign independent policy, to the actual attitude of political forces abroad, and reflect the political will and opinion of the entire politically active emigration. Only under these preconditions will this body be able to properly fulfil its tasks and not slip into the role of a nominally existing factor that gives ministerial titles, as was the case with the exiled UPR Government.

The platform of the OUN (r)'s entry into the National Council in its second point quite clearly outlines the prerequisites for the bold recognition of the State Centre in exile: namely, if it is truly reformed, renewed and built on a broad political and public base, in accordance with the current demands of Ukrainian liberation. This is a prerequisite for our positive attitude towards its Executive Body. Our Organization can participate in it only if its composition and structure meet these requirements and if it is given the opportunity to assume co-responsibility for its activities in proportion to its capabilities, its role in the current liberation struggle, its strength and influence among the citizenship.

Unfortunately, even before the formation of the Executive Body, there were disturbing tendencies on the part of those factors who hold the initiative and decision-making power to conduct business on the old rails, the old system that had completely proved itself wrong. Instead of being guided solely by the need to ensure intensive activity appropriate to the needs of today's liberation, to gain the strongest political base for the foreign political work of the State Centre - the support of the movement that is struggling in Ukraine and has the strongest positions in the exile - narrow party combinations are instead coming to the fore. There is a tendency to ignore the role of our Organisation in the current liberation struggle, its contribution to the social and political life of the current emigration in Europe, and its greatest organisational and human resources to deploy its work. There is a tendency to disregard our willingness to cooperate and to place us in the decorative role of extras or contracted fossil fuels without influence on the policy of the Executive Body.

We are not thinking of taking on such a role, because it would not bring any benefit to the state of affairs, would not actually improve things, but would only create a false external impression. We will not compete for places, for titles, and if this were to continue, we would not have a hand in harmful development. The composition of the Executive Body should give a clear image of the responsibility of political environments and units for the policies and activities of the State Centre in exile. It needs to be thoroughly renewed, reformed and corrected, because only this can make it an effective factor. Personal changes, of which there have been many, will not help. The whole point of creation

The purpose of the National Council is to create a truly new political foreign centre that will meet the modern requirements of independent political action abroad and the current structure of Ukrainian political forces, while adhering to the state and legal traditions.

The factors that have the initiative, the power to decide and the main responsibility should be expected to make a serious and correct decision. If things remain as they are, then the mobilisation and determination of the entire Ukrainian community abroad will be the ultimate goal. The case of the emigrant State Centre is the case of the entire politically active emigration, not a group of people or parties.

The will and opinion of the broader emigrant population must be duly respected and considered, as it is also responsible to its native land for what does. When this does not happen in the usual way, as is the case in political life, in the system of democracy, then the decisive expression of the will of the general public must come to the fore. The state and political centre abroad is the good of the whole nation, which lies in the hands and responsibility of the entire emigration, not a narrow group of people.

We are members of the National Council with a clear goal: to make every effort to ensure that it and the entire emigrant State Centre are indeed what they are, that they play the role and carry out the political work that their position requires. We will fight for this, for the right liberation action, consistently and unyieldingly, both in the forum of the National Council and in our broad political activity among the entire emigration. We will not allow ourselves to be led away from this and will not retreat until we have achieved complete recovery and directed the entire Centre to the path of correct independent activity. If our measures at the closed forum of the National Council were unsuccessful because of the artificially created quantitative ratio of representation of individual groups, which is not in proportion to the actual ratio of forces, then we would be forced to address the emigrant community directly and take appropriate actions to improve and correct it. By joining the National Council, we will not abandon our active attitude.

If the factors responsible for the formation of the Executive Body of the State Emigration Centre had not taken due account of the actual state and needs of the current emigration struggle,

has made it impossible for us to participate in its present composition, our principled position with regard to the National Council and the entire centre, as outlined in the pledge of 5.iv.1948 (1948 - D.C.), has not changed. If the present structure and composition of the Executive Body were adapted to the backroom party combinations rather than to the requirements of independent political action, if it contained units compromised by activities that were at variance with the liberation struggle, its goals and independent policy, or those who had already clearly demonstrated their inability to properly solve such tasks, then we would dissociate ourselves from it, would not participate in it and would seek to replace it with another composition. Our attitude to the activities of such an unacceptable Executive Body will always be verbal and constructive. If its activities and policies are correct and useful for the liberation cause, we will have a positive attitude, and when necessary, we will support correct, independent actions. If it is not the policy, activities or individual events that are harmful or wrong, we will resolutely oppose them.

This development has another, particularly important, implication for the Organization's work abroad, in that it makes it easier for it to concentrate its energies and attention on its most important tasks.

The OUN's Foreign Units are always trying to implement the main guideline of foreign activity: to concentrate their efforts and work on the most inherent revolutionary and liberation tasks of the OUN. Those tasks are directly related to the regional struggle in the native lands, are its framework and manifestation in foreign lands, help it or serve to prepare and continue it. This requires the struggle against hostile, primarily Bolshevik actions and agents among the emigrants, work on the lines of anti-Bolshevik revolutionary and liberation movements of other peoples, as well as foreign policy work on the lines of assistance to the regional struggle. In the directives of the Leadership, at conferences, and in the planning of work, special emphasis is always placed on this. However, despite these efforts of the Leadership, too little has been done in this direction, not enough. There has been no proper response, no readiness and direction of forces and weight from the organisational network abroad.

The reason is not only the absence or dulling of revolutionary readiness among the members, but also the fact that the whole of the Organisation on foreign

The local authorities, in particular the leading local officials, are too busy with various current emigration activities. Attempts to tear them away from what they have become involved in, what has tied up their energies, have had very little success.

The suction force of emigration work was too intense. A superficial assessment of this phenomenon was widely spread, as if our cadres were drawn into this work because it was easier, and for the sake of power and profit they pushed for leadership positions. The real reason was that, in the absence of any other initiating and ordering factor, in the most intensive foreign labour, our cadres, as the most proactive and brightest element, were responsible for organising all social life. By engaging in this work on the ground, the organisational staff increasingly drew the entire organisational system into it, and it was always difficult to disengage.

The establishment of the National Council and the Executive Body of the state-political centre, which assumes responsibility for the entirety of emigrant life and activity, lifts from the cells of our Organisation a significant part of the responsibility that fell to them by force of fact.

This will eliminate what has been weighing down the capabilities of the Organisation in the main area of direct political struggle. The Organisation abroad must devote itself with all its energy and attention to those most important, inherent tasks of fighting the enemy, tasks in which no one is going to replace it.

#### **IV**

In this "Word", much space is devoted to the problems that we face in connection with the creation of the Ukrainian National Council. But this is not about the National Rada itself, because it has not yet taken shape, its fundamental political issues have not yet been crystallised, the whole thing has not yet emerged from the chaos of various combinations; it has not yet become an active political factor for us to put it in the centre of our attention. However, against this background, a number of ambiguities, doubts, different opinions and contradictions have emerged within us. The question of our position in relation to the National Council became the background against which some of the main issues of our policy, including internal policy, the question of hierarchical ordering of various partial goals of our activities, the question of different assessments of certain phenomena of Ukrainian political reality, and in connection with all this, the question of

of our tactics. It is not just a question of how to act against the National Council, but a deeper, fundamental question of how we should proceed in our activities abroad.

The foreign branches of the Organisation must be internally capable of clearly defined and dynamic political work on the internal Ukrainian front as well. To do so, they must have a unanimous, developed approach to fundamental issues, an unquestionable general line. In order to be able to use the most appropriate tactics in any situation, the Organisation must have full ideological and political cohesion. All ambiguities and doubts must be clarified, differences eliminated and, most importantly, less important goals subordinated to more important ones, everywhere, in all cells, among all members.

All the inequalities in political thought and attitudes within our ranks are largely due to a lack of exchange of ideas and clarification of problems down to the very basics. The purpose of this letter is to provide clarification to all nationalist revolutionaries abroad. In order not to speak in the abstract, we take live political phenomena and provide the necessary explanations against their background. We need to speak quite openly and clearly, because the worst condition is when unresolved or unclear political issues cause confusion, paralyse the ability to act, and finally come out in uncoordinated, contradictory steps. Therefore, the main problems of our policy must be highlighted in our ranks, and disagreements must be addressed against their background.

We must be careful not to allow such manifestations to creep into our ranks abroad, which, as a result of confusing ends with means, or by applying inappropriate principles and rules to individual problems, can divert our actions from the main goal. The front of the liberation struggle against the inherent enemy must never be replaced or weakened by internal Ukrainian oppositions. We cannot make principles, political foundations out of something that is important only in one particular situation or is a matter of tactics. A principled policy means that we consistently pursue one main goal by the most successful, most confident means in all situations, under all changes, without deviating from it, implementing the same basic principle. We now have one basic principle, one main goal - the Sovereign Unified Ukrainian State. We are moving towards it steadily. And our path is

- This is the path of revolutionary liberation struggle. It is the only one we have because it is the only certain one and the only possible one. Everything proves this to us: our own history and the experience of others, the whole reality in which we live. This does not mean that we would reject another way, if it were more certain to achieve a Sovereign Unified State. But it is not. And this is no longer a matter of principle, but simply a matter of political realism.

Some people think that the internal political tactics used by the Organisation in one period of its activity have become a principle, are mandatory in every situation and do not allow for change. It is wrong when someone, thinking that such a change is harmful, instead of arguing for it with political expediency and proving it, uses phrases about principle and opportunism. We must clearly understand that all our problems are based on the principle of the struggle for liberation, for the state, for sovereignty, through our own liberation struggle. And all issues of domestic policy are resolved in the way that is most appropriate in a given situation from the point of view of the liberation struggle.

To make a principle out of a once-adopted tactic and, as a consequence, to stiffen it, instead of constantly adapting it to current political expediency, would lead us to the point where, for the sake of misunderstood straightforwardness applied in the wrong place, we would move away from the main goal.

The use of the definition of opportunism must be based on the same understanding of this concept and its proper use. In our internal life, there can be no frivolous or deliberately demagogic attachment of this accusation to one or another of our political tactics. Political opportunism, in the negative sense it has acquired in our dictionary, is understood as the adaptation of oneself, one's being and action to external factors by deviating from one's basic goals and values. And this deviation gives a negative meaning to adaptation. On the other hand, there is no negative opportunism in this adaptation of the way of being and acting to other factors or to the situation, which aims to achieve its main goals, preserve values, and indeed leads to this. Thus, we remain true to our basic principle when we adapt the line of our internal policy to the current situation and to the entire internal Ukrainian population in exile, so that

we assure or facilitate the strengthening of the right independent action, and when the cause of liberation does not lose anything, but only gains. And the fact that sometimes we have to retreat from position that is not decisive from the point of view of the liberation cause is quite understandable and normal. In all struggles and in all reasonable politics, the point is to achieve the main goal by sacrificing small, partial positions and values. This is the essence of any victory, any gain. And the sacrificed, lost values are the price of victory. The greater the goal, the more difficult the competition, the greater the sacrifices. Instead, woe and mockery to those who engage in a competition, a fight for a great goal, and in the competition itself, blinded, spend their energy on gaining or maintaining some partial, not final position and therefore lose. To lure the opponent into this, to chain his attention and strength in the struggle for small, partial positions and to finish him off is the task of a great artistic game. But letting yourself get caught up in such things is the role and destiny of unskilled and unsuccessful people.

In our competition, we have to move towards the big goal step by step, from milestone to milestone, from stage to stage. And our entire journey is made possible by the constant achievement and realisation of partial goals. But in order not to get lost, we need to have a clearly ordered system of them, a system that is a higher goal that is subordinated to, and, if necessary, sacrifices, another partial goal of a lower order. As a yardstick, the guiding rule is always the same: an assessment of the value of a given cause for the liberation of Ukraine, insofar as it strengthens, facilitates, and elevates the liberation struggle and its success. If one has to choose between several possible paths, it is sometimes difficult to decide which is the best. But there is always the least danger of making a mistake when we constantly check with the same basic yardstick.

Most of all, we must beware that partial goals - means - do not become an end in themselves. This always leads to a mistake, a deviation from the main goal. Here we have to pay special attention to one dangerous manifestation that is evident in our activities abroad and which must be resolutely eradicated. When our movement, the Organisation, or its parts, occupy positions or establish institutions with their members to carry out the work they have planned, it all makes sense as a means to an end. Preservation

This state of affairs is justified as long as it serves this purpose. When that same single-mindedness requires changes to be made, they should be made. But when what was conceived and done to fulfil these functions becomes an end in itself, it is already a harmful process. This leads to such phenomena as the struggle for "power" for the sake of "power" itself, the detachment of established institutions from their inherent tasks and their diversion to other tracks, most often along the lines of personal encroachment, plans or interests of those who receive these delegated tasks and then make it their domain. Such painful phenomena, in addition to cases of ordinary abuse, are rooted in the fact that people, taking up positions or creating institutions as means to an end, seem to forget about it, are captivated by other goals, the benefits that are revealed to them, and lose faith.

Just as units or entire institutions become treacherous and go their own way, towards their own individual goals, so too can an entire political organisation become unfaithful to its own purpose when it begins to treat its group positions as an end in themselves, confines itself to building, defending and using them, and postpones further pursuit of its own goal, the struggle, for later.

Let's return once again to the affairs of our domestic Ukrainian policy abroad, so that there is a common understanding of its basic principles and some tactical measures.

There are other organised political environments abroad - parties, centres, etc. This is a normal state in freer circumstances where there is no direct enemy pressure. There is no forced interference by the enemy or outside forces to guide and shape Ukrainian political life abroad. Thus, it develops and is shaped as it is possible in a foreign land, in an original, relatively free manner.

The main question of our concept of internal Ukrainian politics abroad is this: should we conduct our political activities abroad in a separate manner, with a two-pronged division - alongside our action there will be a separate action of other groups - or should we take the path of unanimity, coordination of foreign work, through unification? Our answer is that if it is possible, we are moving towards unanimity and coordination of all Ukrainian political action abroad along the lines of the current demands of the liberation struggle, by

Creation of a consolidation political centre with the participation of existing political and independent organisations, coordination of the general line and main directions of independent political action abroad at its forum, in accordance with the state and requirements of the integrity of the struggle for state sovereignty and unity of Ukraine. We do not take the path of bifurcation and separation of our political action on our own initiative. We would be forced to choose this path if we failed to realise a healthy political consolidation on the liberation platform, if a political concept that is inconsistent with the requirements of the liberation struggle, contrary to the principles of independence and unity, or if the consolidation work did not carry out proper independent political work due to incapacity or neglect.

Therefore, we consider separation and subsequent bifurcation only as a second possibility, in case of finality. As a matter of principle, we are going to consolidate and cooperate with a clear goal: to direct the integrity of Ukrainian politics abroad to the right path, the one that meets the requirements of the liberation struggle, that is, the path we ourselves want to follow. If all Ukrainian political environments abroad take this path, it will undoubtedly be a greater success than if we walked it alone, with the broad masses in tune with us, and at the same time other factors opposed to us. The question is whether this is possible. We are talking about a foreign political action that in the current situation does not threaten its participants with any particular dangers or persecution, and when it follows the line of the liberation struggle, in particular when it stays within the so-called legal framework. And the political benefits of participating in it, at least in the internal Ukrainian environment, are obvious. So there are real-political evidence that others may take this path. We need to bring them to this point. Another question arises: what would happen in a different situation, when it would be necessary to firmly defend the independence policy, when pressure, repression, etc would come, and other consolidated factors with whom we have contacted and linked the case would go the wrong way for independence and unity? Then they would fall away, they wouldn't be able to carry on, because we wouldn't let them. We will always continue on the right path, and the people and all the active independence activists will go with us.

Consolidation, unanimity of the share, and joining forces in it should not

to bring to mutual understanding, likeness, and levelling. This depends on the strength and tension of ideas and political concepts, on the conscious, planned action of the partners. Whoever is stronger in their ideas, concepts, their system, their actions and their human resources has the data to assimilate to some extent the others ideologically and politically, to make them look like them, if they care about it.

When it comes to the ideological crystallisation and growth of a political movement, the question of whether it should separate or cooperate with others must have different solutions, depending on the stage of development and strength. A movement that is in the initial stages of ideological crystallisation runs the risk of being confused when it approaches other movements that are already developed, mature and dynamic. Therefore, the political instinct dictates that every movement at this stage sharply dissociate itself from other movements, emphasise the difference between its positions and those of others as much as possible in order to define itself clearly and complete the crystallisation process. Weakened, decaying political environments, although ideologically crystallised, tend to blur or merge into dynamic ones in contact with them.

Are there any such dangers to our movement? Of course not. In the whole of Ukrainian national life, it has the healthiest, strongest ideological positions. It has a great action dynamic, the most ideological and active people. The nationalist idea, the revolutionary and liberation concept, the modern struggle initiated, organised and ideologically defined by the revolutionary OUN - all of these are reflected in the independent struggle of an entire nation. The ideological and political values of the OUN and its revolutionary action, together with the UPA, form the core of the entire struggle of the Ukrainian people in the present day, and they cannot be destroyed or decomposed by such an enemy as Bolshevism. Given this test of the strength of our movement, our idea, our Organisation, our type of nationalist revolutionary fighter, can we doubt that these values will become the foundation of an entire independent political life abroad, the core of every healthy community, the engine of all action? Whoever thinks that in order to maintain the purity of the idea and our concept, to fly an untainted flag, the OUN(r) abroad must dissociate itself from political groups, not try to make everyone follow the same liberation path, is underestimating

The vitality of our Organisation, which we have clear evidence of in our native lands. Such anxiety is unfounded.

When we say that we need to unite with others and take part in a joint action, we believe that we are embarking on the path of ideological penetration and mastery of the whole of political life. This is precisely what we need to do in our activities. This is the only way to penetrate others with our ideas, our concept, our independent idea. Because of this, they can take our position in the most important matters. To do this, we need to reduce and eliminate the impenetrable walls of fundamental separation that stand between us and others; let the walls of ideas, concepts, and organisations alone remain. These walls were once needed to protect the movement, but now they are an obstacle to expanding its influence.

Our goal is - and we say this explicitly - the organic, ideological and political penetration and content of the whole of Ukrainian life, both in our native lands and abroad. The movement must always have this goal, strive for it, and never give it up. This goes along the lines of our liberation struggle, because it is about engaging forces in the struggle and reducing internal obstacles. But the question is how to do it, by what method and system.

We reject totalitarian and mechanistic methods. Not because they are "out fashion", because we opposed them in 1940, when they were very "fashionable" in some places. But simply because we consider them incompatible and inappropriate for us, for our soil.

The mechanistic-totalitarian method of mastering the environment consists in the fact that, on the one hand, it forcibly eliminates all other existing political environments, depriving them of the possibility of existence and action. It forces every human unit that wants to engage in creative, leading, initiating activities to enter its totalitarian system or closes the road to it, shapes it by coercive methods and places its loyalists in central, leading positions in all life. In the long run, such a system is always harmful, because through violence, mechanical rather than natural selection, through the destruction of the freedom of the masses, it contains the most elementary tendencies of deprivation and decay.

Our way, our method is organic, ideological and political penetration

and content. It has two ways, two phases, which operate in a coincidental way in the whole process. The first, main phase is the organic growth of the nationalist movement, the increasing capture of the best elements with our ideas, their involvement in the Organisation and in actions in which they develop, improve and work creatively. This phase includes the integrity of the Organisation's own activities in all aspects and the mobilisation of the masses in the actions it initiates and organises.

The second, derivative phase is an intermediate effect on the whole of life, including other political environments. This is the penetration of our ideas, our political concept, the direction and method of independent action into the entire Ukrainian world; the latter assimilates them more and more, and they become more and more a national good. This penetration forces other political environments to adapt their ideological and programmatic positions to adopt the values that are becoming an integral part of all-Ukrainian political thought and action and that our movement has made possible. It does not matter that other political environments do this out of necessity, under pressure, and not for their own ideological reasons, but to stay on the surface of life, to keep in with this life. The most important thing for the cause is that this process takes place. It is always happening, and when our movement is isolated, it does not enter into any kind of cooperation with other environments.

Its dynamics, successes, and the enthusiasm of the masses force other environments to take from it what gives the greatest effect, to the extent that they are able to do so. But this process is much faster and more intense when there is some kind of common action, a common forum, a quality of joint action, than when they are completely separated and opposed.

The process of assimilation of the values and achievements of our movement by other political environments is always balanced by the fact that the OUN constantly nurtures, develops and improves the nationalist idea "in its purest form", always leads the way in its implementation, combats its distortions and abuses, and thus ensures that the movement does not lose its way, disappear into the sand. The internal competition on the ideological and political front must be constantly maintained, equally in any balance of power, whether in separation or consolidation. The question of whether separation and bifurcation of the front, or cooperation and ideological penetration, can be interpreted as a matter of urgency

political tactics, from the point of view of the current situation and expediency, or as a matter of the movement's fundamental guidelines. In this second case, we must have a crystallised view and the same, binding line for all. Because one or the other solution to such a fundamental problem leads to far-reaching, divergent consequences. The same movement cannot walk with one foot on one road and the other on the other, when these roads diverge. When the same position is fully thought through in this matter, then differences of opinion about our ongoing domestic political tactics will be eliminated.

We strongly oppose the principle of separating our movement and our political action from the rest of Ukrainian organised political life and action, the principle of bifurcation. We recognise and implement the principle of competition for one coordinated independent political action, the principle of co-operation between all Ukrainian independent political environments, the principle of organic, ideological and political penetration and content. We go for a separate independent action only when the liberation cause requires it, when the attitude of others makes it impossible to take a single joint political action in line with the needs of the liberation struggle.

Our principled position is dictated by the needs of the liberation struggle, which requires the concentration of all forces, and the basic ideological resolutions of our movement, which determine its role in the life and development of the Ukrainian people. The first motivation, in terms of the needs of an independent policy, has been presented earlier. In terms of the development of the movement itself, the situation is as follows: if the line of separation and bifurcation of the fronts were accepted as a basis, the movement would eventually face an alternative: either to abandon the ideological and political coverage and content of the whole of life, including political life, or to take the path of consistent negation of all other organised forces.

We consider it wrong for the nationalist, revolutionary and liberation movement to put itself in such a situation, in front of such an "either/or". Both are at odds with its idea. A monopoly-totalitarian system is harmful to the development of a nation, always detrimental to the dominant political monopoly and its ideas. The most favourable system for the whole nation and for every healthy political movement is one in which genuine freedom reigns, in which ideas, political programmes and concepts develop and compete freely, political organisations

freely cultivate, disseminate and conduct their activities. There is free competition, comparison, mutual influence, growth and spread of what works best, and the disappearance of everything that is unfit, inferior, weak or obsolete. In such a system, in such an atmosphere of freedom, the nationalist movement has more data to win over the soul of the Ukrainian people and do them the best service possible. And this is exactly what we are talking about. In a system of true freedom, rivalry between different ideological, social and political movements and organisations is resolved by the criteria of the ideological and moral order, not by coercion and violence. We are fighting for such a system of true freedom and will implement it.

The tree is recognisable by its vegetables, and the factors of political life are recognisable by their deeds. In essence, it makes no difference whether a political factor explicitly recognises totalism and mono-party tendencies or only acts in a way that leads in that direction, even if it has not thought it through, and pays lip service to democracy and stands up for it. Similarly, it does not matter whether someone speaks of being democratic in the spirit of fashion and according to the taste of the times or not, what matters is where their actions lead.

In Ukrainian life abroad, we encounter many examples how various groups, which at every turn make noise about their democratic and anti-totalitarian attitude, often disregard others and behave autocratically when they get their hands on some kind of "power", initiative, or decision-making ability. We do not think that this should be labelled as dictatorship or totalitarianism, as is often done for demagogic or even denigrating purposes. We consider it simply a manifestation of the social and political primitivism and egoism of a clique. But such an attitude always leads to the same practical consequences.

The existence and operation of various political trends and organised environments is a natural, normal phenomenon that we accept, that we recognise as justified and do not seek to eliminate. We draw a conclusion from this, put our guidelines into practice, and eliminate manifestations that are unnecessary and that would lead us in a different direction or portray us in a false light. Our system of action must be such that it does not contradict the basis of the multi-party system of Ukrainian political life, gives us a way to act within it, and at the same time opens the way for us to grow, constantly spread our movement, penetrate and content our

ideas of a whole life. The principle of the fundamental separation of oneself and one's own division from other organised forces is contrary to this.

A few practical conclusions. When we implement the direction of cooperation with and influence on others, we count among our successes not only our own actions, but also the influence on other environments, if they take the right positions and fight a useful struggle for the nation. In contrast, from the point of view of mono-party or outright narrow-group egoism, such conversion of other rivals to the right path is viewed negatively, because it strengthens their positions and makes it more difficult to remove them from political life. For the same reason, they are most sharply opposed to other organisations that are most closely related in terms of ideological and programmatic positions and political work, because they are the closest competitors. On the contrary, from the point of view of integrity and cooperation with others, we treat our relatives as our relatives, cooperate with them most closely, and want them to become stronger than our more distant opponents. Partisan egoism often drives individuals and groups to the point where they would rather no one do something useful for the common cause when they themselves cannot.

If we analyse internal Ukrainian political life in the freer conditions of emigration in this way, outside of the struggle and entertainingly, we come to the following conclusion: the motives of narrow-group egoism and blindness, the motives of personal careerism and clique struggle for power, fundamental intolerance of other political factors and the programmatic orientation towards mono-partisanship or exclusivity - all these motives lead to the same action in practice. And the second conclusion from this analysis is that the entire Ukrainian political life in exile suffers from the same epidemic: all the talk about democracy and the national cause, but in reality, fierce group or personal egoism and careerism. We see too many of these manifestations in the entire consolidation campaign, around the National Council and in individual environments. Our environment, in a broader sense, is not free from such unhealthy manifestations.

We need to treat everything, and we have to start with ourselves.

The liberation struggle and the proper development of Ukrainian political life require that two processes take place in harmony: first, the process of crystallisation and victory of the healthiest national idea, the most correct liberation and political concept,

their dominance in the whole political life and their rivalisation in unanimous independent activity and struggle. And the second, parallel process

- This is the growth and unification of forces, their internal relationship, which does not allow for self-destruction and mutual paralysis, but rather excites, raises the potential of all and sacrifice in the liberation work. Such a harmonious reconciliation of these two processes is realised through the intensification of our own activities, the universal bonding of our movement, through cooperation with other environments in independent action, through the imbibing and content of the whole with our ideas. This is our concept of internal politics. And at the heart of it all is the directing of all the forces, all the energy and attention of the liberation struggle to the struggle, and abroad to foreign independence action.

Our victory is the victory of our idea, its full implementation. is a secondary matter how much of it we implement , how much done by others, and how much is done together. It is our duty to do as much as we can ourselves, and at the same time to make sure that others do as much as possible.

A few more sentences on the matter of other forces joining the independent foreign action.

The UGVR Foreign Office, the UPA unit that raided the West, the OUN(r) Foreign Units and all nationalist revolutionaries have special obligations to the struggle in their native lands. Everyone bears the first and foremost responsibility for what has been done for the liberation cause, what the foreign action looks like, and what its achievements are.

Being directly connected with the regional revolutionary liberation formation UGVR-UPA-UN, everyone has a duty to represent it abroad. But it should be interpreted as the greatest obligation, as the first and main responsibility, not as a monopoly. The liberation struggle is being waged today by the entire Ukrainian people. The entire political emigration abroad represents them and their struggle. As a collective representation, it has a duty to stage an independent action abroad worthy of the liberation struggle in Ukraine and in line with its demands. The whole of the emigration, all its organised factors, bear joint responsibility for the work abroad. We need to awaken and raise this sense of duty, to mobilise everyone for action. And above all, we must do everything possible to keep the emigration together,

All its parts felt connected to the struggle in the homeland. There is no need to remain silent, to obscure the actual situation in our native lands, what the struggle looks like there, what forces are involved, what the whole liberation and revolutionary formation is. It would be harmful to introduce disorientation in this matter or to allow it. But the attitude must always be such that it does not lead to an indication what factors are not involved in this struggle.

Because this is not what we are talking about, and it proves nothing.

We should be wary of a tone that gives the impression that we want to monopolise the right to work abroad in favour of the struggle in our native lands or to capitalise on that struggle for group purposes.

The difficult struggle in Ukraine is for the good of the entire Ukrainian nation. Abroad, one can and should only serve the cause of the liberation struggle, and everyone must do this to the best of their ability, but do it right. Every Ukrainian and every political factor abroad can carry out activities useful for the liberation cause, and can serve the liberation struggle in the homeland well, whether by promoting it, or in foreign policy work, or by spreading the idea of a common front of revolutionary and liberation struggles of all anti-Bolshevik peoples. In this way, he is included in the liberation front and has a relationship to the liberation struggle. And this relationship can only be one for all: service to the liberation struggle of Ukraine.

Nationalist revolutionaries!

I am writing to you with this long "word" to clarify our position and to highlight the essential content of our policy on the issues raised. I wanted to convey to you the spirit, approach and attitude, not just directives or explanations. To that end, I have tried to cover in detail the issues that are the most confusing.

Competition has become our natural environment, the content of our life is struggle. For us, political activity and work have always been a struggle, not only in content but also in form. We were always at the front, facing the enemy. All other matters, including domestic politics, were always interpreted and solved in the light of the fight against the enemy. Those who fought against him, those who were friends and brothers, those who took his side, were not on this side of the front. This is the case today in our native lands, where our friends, the bulk of the OUN and UPA, continue their struggle, even harder and more

more important.

In the struggle, we developed and hardened the irreplaceable attitude of the revolutionary fighter. Abroad, there is no environment of direct struggle, no direct encounter with the enemy.

But that enemy is here, too, and he is against us. Only invisible, hidden. And here we have to fight him. Not only fight, but we must destroy his actions, his tentacles, with which he is trying to entangle Ukrainian independent life. It is equally necessary to eradicate all those evils in Ukrainian political life that allow the enemy to act in its guts and that, without an enemy, corrode Ukrainian forces and pull them away from the liberation cause. By working abroad, you can do a lot to help the liberation struggle and strike the enemy. From here you can help the struggle in your native land in various forms. From here, we all need to re-enter the armed political struggle against the enemy, and we need to prepare for this in the best possible way. These are our essential tasks, in which no one can replace us, and we must devote the most attention and energy to them. For these tasks, we must preserve and develop our fundamental posture. At the same time, we have to do other work that is important and useful for our cause. In this work, we have to overcome unjustified difficulties from the Ukrainian environment, to deal with opponents who, for reasons we do not know, sometimes engage in disputes and disputes out of sheer malice. Cases arise in which it is not always clear where the truth lies and what to do. There is no such clarity as in a direct struggle. You can easily get confused and lost.

But those who orientate their every step towards the main goal - the liberation of Ukraine - and who are guided in every case and every situation by one measure: what is useful for the liberation cause and how much.

## **Ukrainian national revolution, not only anti-regime resistance**

*This article is directed against the hostile attempts of those opponents of Ukrainian nationalism who in the 1950s wanted to undermine or divert the Ukrainian liberation movement. At that time, some Ukrainian socialists and members of the URDP, the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party, created by Ivan Bahrianyi in exile, tried to spread the concept of national communism and put forward the slogan "For a democratic system in Ukraine" as a flagship slogan, rather than the slogan "For an independent national state of the Ukrainian people". Pointing to the danger of slogans of "only anti-regime struggle", Stepan Bandera also highlighted the falsity of Moscow-Bolshevik "democratic" slogans.*

*The article was signed by the author's full name and surname and was originally published in the Munich weekly Ukrainian Samostoynik, Year I, no. 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, and 15 of 1950, later reprinted under an abbreviated title (without the word "only") in monthly Herald, New York, ed. OOMCU, year iii, chs. 2/37 to 12/47, February-December 1950, and later in the collection "Ukraine against Moscow", ed. OUN Publications, Munich, Library of the Ukrainian Underground, part 2, 1955, pp. 338-388.*

*Excerpts or sections from this article were published: under the title "Our liberation concept" in "Voyatska Varta", page of the T-th Column of UPA soldiers in Canada and the United States, year Viii, no. 5/35, supplement to the weekly "Fomin Ukrainy", year XVI, no. 43/805, 17 October 1964; under the title "Our Position towards Russia" in the weekly "Ways of Victory", Munich, year XV, no. 41/764, 13 October 1968, and in the "Fomin Ukrainy", Toronto, year XXI, no. 23/1046 and 24/1047, 31 May and 7 June 1969.*

The Ukrainian liberation movement, driven by the ideology and concept of Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism, is the only one in our political life of the last two decades that has consistently followed its own path, constantly growing, continuing and spreading its struggle through all the enormous upheavals and changes that our Motherland is experiencing. It overcomes all attempts by Ukraine's enemies to destroy it.

Bolshevik Moscow rightly sees the Ukrainian

the nationalist, revolutionary and liberation movement of the most implacable, dangerous enemy, which is continuously fighting it on all fronts and segments, which is constantly advancing, not only supporting but also successfully spreading and consolidating the anti-Bolshevik liberation revolution. Our struggle against Moscow is being waged everywhere, in Ukraine, among other peoples enslaved by Bolshevism, and abroad. Along with our offensive against the positions of Moscow imperialism and communism, the Bolsheviks are making every effort to destroy our movement everywhere, to the root. The main front of the struggle is in the Ukrainian lands. There is a continuation of it in foreign lands, and the nationalist movement is acting as a united force and action everywhere.

All of Moscow's attempts to destroy the Ukrainian nationalist, revolutionary and liberation movement of the OUN-UPA physically, with a total attack from the front, were in vain. Despite the most difficult conditions of struggle and great sacrifices, our movement continues to fight and develop further. The great, pure idea of the Ukrainian nation, the struggle for the freedom of Ukraine and for God's Truth on Ukrainian soil is an inexhaustible source of strength for our movement, and the juicy signs of a nationalist revolutionary, perfect methods of organisation and ways of action developed in the struggle give him unbreakable strength, power and hardening. God will bless and help our struggle for truth, against the red kingdom of Satan.

The enemy understands that physical extermination alone will not defeat the Ukrainian revolution and Ukrainian nationalism. Therefore, it is making every effort to attack the very sources and main internal supports of its power, and of course is trying to destroy the very idea of Ukrainian nationalism.

Against the nationalist movement, both in Ukraine and abroad, the Bolsheviks are persistently trying to destroy it and disintegrate it. But direct attacks on it from Bolshevik positions are unsuccessful. Therefore, the enemy is trying to achieve its goal with the help of those anti-nationalist factors and phenomena that exist in Ukrainian political life abroad. He tries to use them in various ways to advantage, to strengthen them and to direct them to the rails he needs. To beat the nationalist movement with Ukrainian hands is the main direction of Bolshevik sabotage.

On the ideological and political level, all tendencies approach communist positions and build transitional platforms on them lead to the same consequences, which are beneficial to Bolshevik desires.

The first goal of the enemy's attempts to demobilise Ukrainian independence and liberation movement and to fill in the gaps between them is to blur the clear line between the independence and liberation movements and Russian or communism. Any such phenomenon that creates a willfulness of intransigence against the enemy and its position is harmful to the liberation cause, regardless of the motives behind it.

In Ukrainian political life abroad, there are many such manifestations that contribute to Bolshevik attempts to destroy the nationalist movement and undermine its liberation action. They have heterogeneous causes, and among their advocates and executors, there is often a lack of proper awareness and understanding of the harmful work they do in relation to the liberation struggle against Moscow. But this lack of understanding does not diminish the harmfulness of such phenomena. They inherently benefit the enemy's efforts. On the contrary, it often increases this harmfulness and is covered by the main tendency of Bolshevik Moscow to attack, undermine and destroy an independent nationalist movement from an allegedly Ukrainian position, with Ukrainian hands, and to use Ukrainian forces. In assessing and interpreting such phenomena, we must look first and foremost at their actions and consequences, and not just at the motives and intentions of their perpetrators.

The struggle on the ideological and political front against all kinds of Moscow's offensive and intrigue is of paramount importance in the whole liberation struggle. The nationalist movement must stand in a completely pure and revolutionary uncompromising manner against everything that comes from Moscow Bolshevism or leads to it, even in further, immediately unseen consequences. All issues of the ideological and political order must be viewed primarily from the perspective of the struggle against Moscow imperialism and its instrument, communism. Anything that weakens our position in terms of blunting, diminishing or obscuring the diametrical opposition, revolutionary irreconcilability, ideological, moral and programmatic and conceptual superiority of Ukrainian nationalism to Moscow Bolshevism must be exposed and eliminated from our political

life. We must also look at what is happening in the international forum in this way and decipher the true, deeply hidden meaning of the Bolsheviks involved in, the Bolshevik strategy in the ideological forum on a global scale.

We set ourselves the task of elucidating in more detail some of the attempts by open and covert opponents of Ukrainian nationalism to divert the liberation movement from its proper path, to impose on it incorrect and harmful positions. We are not here to deal with anything that openly fights or overturns the revolutionary liberation movement. We want to reveal the true nature of such phenomena, which do so with a confessional attitude towards it.

The leading line, common to all such attempts, is to divert the modern liberation struggle from its nationalist path, the path of a full-fledged Ukrainian National Revolution, to the path of anti-regime resistance. This line is common to those who, for various reasons, have moved away from Ukrainian nationalism or are unable to accept it and would like to drag the entire liberation movement down the anti-nationalist path, as well as to those who consider this line to be a transitional, now final stage towards the undermining and complete destruction of the liberation movement.

In an attempt to lead the liberation movement off its nationalist revolutionary path, its opponents often use the method of falsely portraying and explaining the true positions of the modern liberation struggle in Ukraine, as well as justifying such attempts by falsely highlighting the needs and conditions for the development of the liberation struggle. One of these false suggestions, which try to find fault with our movement and influence its further development, is the following combination of theses and conclusions.

In 1941-43, they say, it turned out that the ideology and programme of Ukrainian nationalism and its concept of the Ukrainian national revolution were unfavourable in the Central and Eastern Ukrainian lands. During the twenty years of Bolshevism's domination in Ukraine, there were such changes in the socio-political thinking of the broad masses of the Ukrainian people that the worldview, ideological and programmatic goals of Marx-Bolshevism in theory were universally recognised, accepted as correct, most gradual, and the best, most active element

of the middle and younger generations, brought up on Bolshevik ideology, is by conviction ideologically communist. All the discontent - the ground for mobilising the masses for revolutionary struggle - among the overwhelming majority of the people - is not along the line of a fundamental rejection of communism, its goals and basic principles, but along the line of rejecting only the actual practice of the Bolshevik regime, which stands in complete opposition to the "pleasant, noble" ideas of theoretical communism. In terms of national and political consciousness and the same aspirations, the masses of the Ukrainian people now have no fundamental deep denial of the very essence of imperialism and the spirit of Moscow, which is trying to stifle the spiritual culture, national, state and socio-economic identity of the Ukrainian nation.

The sense and awareness of the national instinct seems to have been dulled. There is only denial of the socio-economic exploitation, economic oppression of Ukraine and the terrorist totalitarianism of the Bolshevik regime.

Therefore, the struggle for the liberation of Ukraine, in order to attract the broad masses, and above all the dynamic young element capable of revolution, to active participation, must be staged as a whole, and therefore, in terms of programme and concept, adapted to the data, must turn from the nationalist path to the path of anti-regime struggle. The struggle to overthrow the Bolshevik enslavement of Ukraine cannot be based on a nationally conscious, resolutely anti-Moscow and anti-Bolshevik revolutionary element, because there are supposedly very few of these in Ukraine, but must be based on everything that is directed against the regime itself, against the existing state. And in this, one must count not only on those who are fundamentally against Moscow imperialism and against communism, but also on those who are in favour of communism, for its implementation, and who are hostile to the regime and its practices for "betraying communism". Instead of the "unpopular" denial of the integrity of Bolshevism, we should recognise the "achievements of the October (i.e. Bolshevik) Revolution" positive and act as their defenders against the regime that betrayed them.

All of this is not seen as auxiliary, tactical means to strengthen or delay our main front, but rather as the basic concept of the liberation revolution. So, these are no longer problems of political tactics in certain areas, in the work of some

environments, but only the issue of our own basic programme. They say that we need to take these basic provisions as the main lines and build everything on them. Accordingly, it is necessary to reject the pre-existing, "already experienced" principles of Ukrainian nationalism, to eradicate them in our own ranks, to change our ideology and programme.

What does this mean?

The very notion of political soil in the OSSU3 that served as a starting point for this concept is based on an incorrect assessment of the soil, national consciousness, political attitudes of the masses and revolutionary, dynamic elements. It denies the nationalist liberation concept, the sufficient vitality and dynamics of natural nationalist potentials in the Ukrainian people, and the ability of the ideology of Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism to capture the people, to raise them to the struggle for "to be or not to be". Instead of a national revolution in the full sense, it puts forward the concept of only anti-regime struggle, following the self-deception that programmatic minimalism is the removal of the regime itself and the correction, not a radical change, of the socio-political system, a slogan of saving the "achievements" of the October Revolution, not a complete separation of its theory and practice, - is more likely to lead the masses to struggle than the maximum programme of our revolution. Such a concept denies the ability of the Ukrainian and other peoples enslaved by Bolshevik Moscow to liberate themselves through a joint revolutionary struggle; it puts all elements dissatisfied with the regime, communist and Russian, in the same position as the decimated anti-Moscow and anti-communist forces.

The entire revolutionary and liberation struggle is defined by two main processes: building the liberation front's own strength and defeating the enemy by destroying its forces and positions. Within this framework, there is a wide range of derivative and transitional processes, such as joining the cooperation or commitment of various outside, alien forces; pulling them away from the enemy; distinguishing it from third factors; demobilising, neutralising various elements in the enemy camp: turning the whole situation from one of striking with the enemy to one that is most favourable for us and difficult for the enemy; intensifying, strengthening some areas and segments of the struggle, and reducing others - in accordance with the ratio of forces and the importance of one and the other

for both sides. Many of these issues are of great importance for the strategy and tactics of the liberation revolution. For their expedient, most successful solution, methods are always applied, always appropriate to the circumstances, and various political actions are carried out, various processes are initiated and strengthened in a foreign, hostile environment.

The organisation of the liberation revolution should be centred on the crystallisation, refinement and dissemination of the nationalist ideology, programme and liberation concept among the masses, and the selection, cultivation and formation of its own strength and its foundation - the cadre of unwavering confessors and fighters. It is necessary to trace deeply what lives and stirs in the people, not only on the surface, what has already been discovered, but also what is often hidden, in the ground. In this case, the essentially unchanging content of nationalist ideology is shaped into the most eloquent specific provisions at the current stage. The forces that are nationalist and revolutionary in their deepest nature are selected, involved and formed. Again, when the work is one-sidedly focused only on current actions and mobilising as many participants as possible, tactical considerations come to the fore. In the correct attitude to our revolutionary work, both processes must always be carried out in harmonious coordination: the thorough formation of the drivers and main force of the revolution on a large scale, consistently, through various stages, and - the conduct of actual revolutionary struggle in the form of various actions that repel the enemy and mobilise the masses.

Some people do not understand and neglect the importance of the process of thoroughly forming the elements of their own strength, reduce revolutionary activity to only current passing actions, so see everything from one angle - mobilisation for these actions by such means and slogans that give the fastest, greatest effect. Because of this one-sidedness, it is easy to lose sight of the direction of development of the national revolution towards a longer-term goal, to take the individual requirements of the tactics of one period of activity as the main concept, as the general line.

The process of collecting, nurturing, forming and growing the liberation revolution's own force must be based on the correct principles of Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism, on its ideological and programmatic truths. Therefore, against their own ranks, in front of the Ukrainian

Our aims, our ideology and programme, our liberation concept in its , must be properly disseminated and presented to the people. Our basic principles must not only be preserved and developed, but also clarified in their own environment in complete purity, without any distortion under the influence of various tactical considerations. Only on this basis, in this spirit, can the ranks of liberation fighters be formed that will not succumb to any enemy attacks. Only by setting before the Ukrainian people absolutely clear, pure and uncompromising goals of the national liberation revolution can they be led to the most difficult struggle, which requires immeasurable sacrifices and which alone can bring the nation's freedom.

All kinds of adaptations of our own ideological and programmatic foundations to external influences, distortion or diminution of them in accordance with tactical requirements at the stages of our activity in a foreign or hostile environment undermine the very foundations of the liberation struggle.

Through ideological and programmatic opportunism, through deviations from the completeness and purity of one's own goals, and by smearing them in the eyes of the masses, the success and expediency of the liberation revolution is questioned, and doubts are instilled as to whether such a struggle for diminished, half-hearted goals that do not fully meet the spirit and needs of Ukraine is possible and appropriate.

Our liberation concept, ideology and programme of Ukrainian nationalism must clearly reflect the most essential aspirations of the Ukrainian people, in the purest form, without extraneous and hostile sway and distortion, and at the same time form the national and political consciousness.

Instead, in all political and propaganda work on foreign soil and against foreign environments, only moments of tactical expediency decide how to approach, what parts and goals of the Ukrainian liberation struggle should be approached and in what light they should be presented. Only a part of the goals of our liberation struggle corresponds to the aspirations of external factors, foreign peoples and some elements that - willingly or unwillingly - are components or tools of the enemy force.

Such elements of our programme, which are of universal significance, are presented and promoted in the same way everywhere, at all levels. However, some of our programme statements, which are fundamental to the whole nationalist ideology, reflecting the specific aspirations and

The needs of the Ukrainian people are not important, indifferent to some outside factors, which our activities also address.

Emphasising such goals and slogans to these outside factors would be completely inappropriate and unsuccessful. In order to gain the favour and cooperation of foreign forces, well as for ideological and moral demobilisation in the enemy camp, we need to select and put forward such slogans from among our own that speak convincingly and attractively to those foreign elements. Instead, if we set only those slogans as programmatic goals for our own camp, if we confine ourselves to them, then instead of mobilising, we would only create confusion and confusion.

As the Ukrainian liberation national revolution unfolds more and more widely, as new segments of the struggle are activated and intensified on a large scale, with influence not only among the Ukrainian people, but with the transfer of our offensive revolutionary and political action to foreign territories and into enemy territory, together with the Ukrainian national revolution becoming the vanguard and organiser of a common anti-Bolshevik liberation revolution of many nations, the arsenal of our political weapons must be very broad. It is of great importance to distinguish between the proper, complete programme, on which our own forces are mobilised and formed, and political propaganda tactics on separate segments. In the course of its revolutionary action, the Organisation has developed high-quality political skills in the use of various political tactics, and it has successfully and accurately selected methods and slogans according to the environment, the field and the specific situation. The wide scope of political work and the corresponding wide range of tactical means characterise the current stage of the revolutionary liberation movement in Ukraine.

In the revolutionary concept, the liberation struggle is waged in all spheres of life, on a broad front, in various forms, as an ongoing and ever-growing process, until complete victory. The revolutionary struggle is a national struggle in terms of spirit and culture, a socio-political and military struggle for the complete destruction of the existing state and its content and for the construction of a completely new one, under every consideration a better state that meets the needs and desires of the people.

of the Ukrainian people. Armed struggle is an essential part of the whole revolution. The national uprising, the armed uprising of an entire nation and the final overthrow of the physical basis and power of the enemy at the appropriate time should complete the liberation struggle, ensure the construction of an independent state, order, national and social freedom.

Insurgent actions and all armed struggle of the military forces of the revolution have the task of repelling the enemy and defending the people, creating support and protection for the driving forces of the revolution, strengthening and enhancing the integrity of the revolutionary process, nurturing, forming and developing the armed forces of the revolution in order to mobilise all the forces of the revolution in the insurgent army at the appropriate stage. In the course of the development of the revolutionary struggle, the size, forms of organisation, pledges and methods of action of the armed forces may vary, and they are systematically regulated in their application to the integrity of the revolutionary process.

In the face of the diversity and complexity of revolutionary action, unity and coherence must prevail. It is assured by ideological unity, one programme and one strategic concept, political and organisational-operational coordination. The ideological, political and organisational-operational unity is the organic unity of the entire Movement, guaranteed from the very beginning.

Some recognise the meaning of the liberation military struggle, neglecting all other areas and types of revolutionary action. Disbelief in the possibility and success of a broad, protracted revolutionary struggle has led some to depend on the development of the international situation and the attitude of outside forces to the cause of the liberation struggle. Such people interpret the entire revolutionary struggle in Ukraine not as an inherent path to liberation, but only as a factor that draws the attention of the outside world to the Ukrainian cause, unites its supporters and facilitates our foreign policy work. Viewing the regional struggle from this single angle, this view recognises the value of the UPA's military actions only because they are the loudest and most attracting the attention of foreign factors. However, the inherent revolutionary process, the involvement of more and more in the liberation struggle, is not essential in the eyes of those who do not believe in their own strength and in the possibility of a liberation anti-Bolshevik revolution. Such a view may seem justified if one looks superficially at the affairs of revolutionary action, at its external manifestations and external effect, and

not on its internal development needs and patterns.

The general political situation after the war made it impossible to expand military operations and insurgency operations. The period of a comprehensive and deep revolutionary process has begun, in which the military side serves primarily to strengthen the socio-political sectors of the revolution. In the holistic strategy of the revolution, the reduction of the effective military force and its actions is in no way equivalent to the weakening, diminution of the strength of the revolution, the entire revolutionary process. Because the insurgent army and military actions are an integral part, one of the functions and forms of the revolutionary struggle, and not a single, closed factor in itself. The UPA's military actions are fully capitalised in favour of the growth of the revolution even when they do not grow and do not quantitatively expand the UPA's forces. They capitalise on the fact that the revolutionary process in other forms is growing and intensifying, spreading the idea of the liberation revolution, and increasing social and political revolutionary actions. When - taking into account the overall situation and the requirements of internal development - the general plan dictates the narrowing of the military sector, the forces of this sector are not demobilised, but transferred to other sectors to strengthen them and continue the same struggle in other forms. The growth of the power of revolution in other forms always carries with it such potentialities that will manifest themselves in military form at the appropriate time. This truth is best confirmed by the creation and brilliant development of the UPA as a result of all the previous activities of the UVO-UN. In the closest cooperation and ideological and political unity of the OUN and UPA, the unanimity and consistency of the entire liberation movement and the most appropriate arrangement of individual forms of revolutionary force and action were ensured from the very beginning.

The ideology, programme, liberation concept, and revolutionary struggle of the Ukrainian nationalist movement create a single, harmonious structure based on a complete Ukrainian worldview. This architectural unanimity and harmony gives the movement its inner strength, action dynamics and resistance to all enemy attacks and blows.

On the other hand, all harmful, wrong and unsuccessful concepts and initiatives in Ukrainian political life have their roots in a foreign worldview, opposed to the Ukrainian one, or in the worldview groundlessness, or are the result of differences between theoretical

recognised worldview principles and everyday political practice. Whoever builds on worldview foundations that are not characteristic of our soil, even with good will and the best of intentions, will not build anything lasting, but will only multiply the ruins. And whoever in practical political action does not pay attention to fixing the main filaments on unshakable ground, whose opportunistic constructions and undertakings are swaying in the wind, staggering and falling down from changing or stronger winds.

A deeper look reveals that the greatest disaster in Ukrainian political life, the greatest internal contradictions and the greatest harm to the liberation struggle, stems from a materialistic outlook, from alien, socialist ideologies and concepts, and from the character flaws of individuals and groups. The Ukrainian nationalist movement does not accept any of the philosophical systems created by foreign thinkers, nor does it engage with them. At the same time, Ukrainian nationalism is characterised by a Ukrainian worldview that is a product of the Ukrainian spirit, nature and the entire Ukrainian people, and that emerged on the basis of a common Christian worldview. It was not created by a single thinker or a particular scientific trend, nor is it scientifically embedded in a philosophical system, but is clearly reflected and operates in the entire life and work of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian person as an ordered, harmonious and complete system of values that has grown organically. The Ukrainian worldview is Christian.

The materialist worldview is the creation of a completely different, alien spirit, on different ground, in its principles and conclusions completely inconsistent with the Ukrainian worldview, with the Ukrainian spirit, and opposed to them. The materialistic worldview was brought into Ukrainian life partly by the hostile domination of Ukraine, partly by socialism, and over the past quarter-century it has been imposed on the Ukrainian people by Bolshevism through all means of violence and terror. Today, it is not only one of the world's worldview doctrines, but the most important, the main factor and means of the enemy to destroy the soul, being, and identity of the Ukrainian nation, to turn the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian person into a malleable object for Moscow's purposes. Therefore, the attitude to the materialist worldview of any organisation in the context of the liberation struggle against Bolshevism is purely political

value.

In Ukraine's liberation struggle against Bolshevik Russia, socialism did the most damage, and it was the worst contributor to Ukraine's ideological, political and military demobilisation in the struggle against Bolshevism. This same bacillus is still active in Ukrainian political life in exile. But today it has no open form in the Ukrainian masses; the existing socialists and socialist parties are living out their lives. Instead, great harm is caused by disguised, hidden socialist tendencies that manifest themselves in various forms, penetrate everywhere, and even try to take root in the revolutionary liberation movement and introduce ideological decomposition into it.

By attributing to socialism a monopoly on the defence of the social position of the workers, identifying it with the programme of social justice and progress, some are trying to spread confusion in this respect, to paralyse sensitivity to all the racial elements of socialist doctrine. There are party novelties, registered under their own name and disguised, which abuse the name of revolutionary liberation factors. Both are masquerading as revolutionary, anti-Bolshevik banners and trying to spread opportunistic tendencies towards communism. They acknowledge the achievements of Marxism-communism and speak of their preservation in the Ukrainian state. In particular, they oppose the categorical rejection of collectivisation and look for positive aspects of it for the national economy. Some advocate the preservation of collective farming alongside private land ownership, while others go even further and advocate the preservation of collectivisation of all agriculture.

All of these socialist and pro-communist tendencies are marked by an attitude as if the struggle of the Ukrainian people, which is also for social liberation, was not against a socialist or communist system, but against a capitalist one. Adopting the Bolshevik view, they treat the social system that existed in Ukraine under Russian occupation until 1917, and in the Western Ukraine under Polish occupation until 1939, or that exists in other countries, as a factor still in force. They deal with it and its various institutions as if we had to fight capitalism, not communism.

They interpret the communist, socialist system, forcibly imposed by Bolshevism, as gradual. Following the model of Bolshevik propaganda, in interpreting social issues, they reproduce the delusion of landlords, capitalists, etc., former factors and phenomena that no longer exist in Ukraine in the same way, in the same formulation, as does Bolshevik demagoguery and the socialist agitprop that has been famous the liberation struggle of 1917-20.

It is clear that the Bolsheviks are doing this in order to appear to the masses as defenders of the capitalist-landlord misery and to portray Bolshevik total emancipation as a paradise. However, the attempt to direct the liberation movement in social issues on the same track as Bolshevik propaganda is tantamount to an act of enemy sabotage. Directing independent energy to the false rails of the struggle against windmills diverts attention from the inherent, most terrible and currently only enemy and enslaver, both national and social, Moscow Communist Bolshevism. The new fellow travellers of socialism speak of the socialist programme of 1917-20 as a progressive programme that should have formed the basis of the social and economic programme of the liberation movement. And the Bolshevik October Revolution, in their interpretation, brought progressive, positive achievements that should not be rejected, but only preserved and consolidated, cleansing them of distortions and regime excesses. Such positions are fundamentally false and harmful.

We are fighting against Moscow Bolshevism in all its manifestations, in all areas. Our struggle is revolutionary, uncompromising, that is, we deny, reject and fight everything purely Bolshevik that it brought and imposed on the Ukrainian people, we reject it in principle, completely. It is wrong to seek out and distinguish the positive aspects of the Bolshevik system, and from the point of view of revolutionary strategy, it is harmful. If there are things, individual phenomena or processes in the sub-Bolshevik reality that are worthwhile and positive in themselves, then this cannot be counted in favour of Bolshevism. For for all its totalitarian recklessness, Bolshevism is not so omnipotent that all activity, all life is shaped only by its will and plans. On the contrary! Resistance to Bolshevism, attempts to shape life in different areas along the lines of natural development

of the peoples it has enslaved and of human needs is manifested in various forms and in all areas, regardless of Bolshevik terror. Bolshevism is not able to completely take over everything and turn it around; it is forced to make concessions here and there.

The Bolsheviks portray natural growth and development, and even forced concessions, as their own achievements, as the realisation of the programme goals of communism, in order to use them for propaganda and to raise their authority in the eyes of the masses. Moscow Bolshevism is trying to turn all the real achievements of the peoples' healthy aspirations for life to its own advantage, for anti-people purposes.

But in all its manifestations and consequences, in all areas, it has only a negative meaning for the Ukrainian people. To speak of the positive pages and achievements of the October Bolshevik Revolution, to attribute to them those positive things that were forced and carried out by the invincible vital forces of the people, and which the Bolshevik Revolution is trying to turn back to the destruction of the people, is a manifestation of a complete misunderstanding of reality or an unacceptable light-hearted perception of enemy sovereignty. Similarly, it is wrong and harmful to blur the line between the Ukrainian liberation revolution of 1917-20 and similar national revolutions of other peoples, on the one hand, and the October Bolshevik revolution, on the other.

From the point of view of the liberation national revolution, which must radically eliminate Moscow-Bolshevik domination and total enslavement, everything that is Bolshevik, reactionary, anti-revolutionary in its content or origin - every tendency that tries to justify, preserve any manifestations and remnants of the Bolshevik system - is reactionary, anti-national.

Bolshevik propaganda tries to impose the view that any struggle against Bolshevism and its system seeks to restore the state, including the social state, that existed before 1917, as if there were only two possibilities: the Bolshevik system or the one imposed on Ukraine by tsarist Russia and other occupiers. In this way, the Bolsheviks are trying to exploit the healthy hatred of the old that is still alive in the memory of the people, to compromise the liberation movement and create a sense of hopelessness and despair.

Ukrainian nationalism rejects and fights Moscow Bolshevism-Communism as categorically as it does any attempt to bring about a state of national-political and socio-economic enslavement by white or any other Russia or other occupiers. The social relations imposed on Ukraine by previous occupiers and any attempt to restore them find in Ukrainian nationalism an irreconcilable enemy. Its goal is to build its own social order in the Ukrainian state, in accordance with the needs and desires of the entire Ukrainian people, which will ensure the best development for the Ukrainian nation and comprehensive freedom, justice and prosperity for all Ukrainian citizens. Here, Ukrainian nationalism follows its own path, taking as its basis and decisive criteria: the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainian family, natural resources, living conditions and needs of Ukraine. From other people's examples and achievements, Ukrainian nationalism takes what is appropriate for the Ukrainian people. From the past, it takes as its basis those values and principles that the Ukrainian people themselves have created in their own development and that correspond to today's life and its level. And all that was imposed on it by foreign domination against its will and aspirations throughout its historical development, both earlier and in the last quarter-century, is rejected.

Waging the struggle against Bolshevik Moscow, we must direct all our attention and energy there. And in the struggle for social liberation, which is impossible without national liberation, the focus must be on the negation and overcoming of the existing hostile Bolshevik system. The total overthrow and destruction of the Bolshevik total enslavement of the people and the individual must stand in the consciousness and attitudes of the masses as the main truth and demand in all social issues. And this is what the revolutionary liberation movement must do, what it must achieve through all its political activity. A true independent cannot talk about the "achievements" of the October Revolution, about some of the positives of communism, about the correctness of the socialist programme, and cannot divert the attention of the masses from the struggle against communism to the ghosts of private capitalism that does not exist in our country.

Because such an attitude to social issues goes a long way towards undermining the anti-Bolshevik revolution, a hostile attitude towards Bolshevism and "all its deeds".

In the development of Ukrainian political thought and political forces, such trends are a recurrence of the socialist diseases that undermined and weakened the national political revival and liberation struggle of 1917-20. They repeat in their entirety the same things that socialist parties did then, in their inner content, spirit, method and background. Both are products of ideological opportunism against the enemy, opportunism that wants to appear revolutionary. These are the actions of such elements that, in the process of the total struggle for national liberation and self-assertion of nations, found themselves in the warring national camp, but did not spiritually free themselves from the ideological pressure of the enemy, or succumbed to it anew and would like the national struggle to go along the line of some kind of compromise with the enemy's "values and achievements". Just as in 1917-20, today's explicit and hidden socialism wants to play the role of political leadership in the liberation camp, to shine with what it adopts from others or even from the enemy, and to direct the liberation movement on such a track.

In terms of size, actual influence and significance in contemporary political life, these phenomena are a small miniaturisation of what socialist parties were in 1917-20. However, the very emergence of such a relapse, such a socialist-opportunist tendency in modern times is a harmful phenomenon and should be completely eliminated from Ukrainian political life.

Putting the slogan "For a democratic system in Ukraine" at the top of the programme of the liberation struggle, instead of the slogan "For an independent national state", has another motive and an extremely harmful aspect. The concept of only an anti-regime struggle is put forward in the form of a project to present the current liberation struggle as a struggle for the structure of the Ukrainian state, not for the achievement of an independent state. This concept crystallised in exile and was persistently promoted when the Ukrainian SSR was admitted to the UN. This fact aroused considerable admiration among some people and cemented their views that the formulation of our liberation policy should be changed accordingly.

The line of thought and argument behind this concept is as follows: it is very difficult to conduct Ukrainian foreign policy in an international forum in the conditions of a non-state nation that is just struggling to create its own state. In such circumstances, it is impossible to act as an independent political

factor, because in the understanding of the principles of international politics, Ukraine did not exist as an independent factor. Through its admission to the UN (now the UN), the Ukrainian SSR gained international recognition as a Ukrainian state and now Ukraine is a subject in international life. Although it cannot pursue its own independent policy and is in fact a colony of Moscow, an instrument of Russian policy, the benefit is that the world recognises the Ukrainian state in principle, comes to terms with the fact of its existence, with the subject position of Ukraine in international relations. This facilitates international recognition of the Ukrainian state in the future (as an independent state), and assures it in advance. From the point of view of international law, there will be continuity of Ukrainian statehood, and the future independent, genuine Ukrainian state will automatically inherit the legacy of the Ukrainian SSR in this respect. The construction of the USSR will have the character of a coup d'état, a change of regime and system in the international legal sense. It will now be much easier to conduct independent foreign policy work when Ukraine has the right of citizenship in an international forum. Accordingly, the proponents of this concept say, in our foreign activities we should interpret the current liberation struggle as a struggle to change the state system and regime in the USSR, not as a struggle for the state itself, for its existence.

In particular, we cannot take the position that the Ukrainian SSR is not a Ukrainian state in front of the outside world. Now, they say, we need to put the case in such a way that the Ukrainian SSR does not have full sovereignty and we are fighting for that sovereignty, for complete separation from the USSR, from Moscow, as well as for a change of government and the structure of the state to a democratic one, for the removal of the communist dictatorship. Such a resolution is necessary in order not to undermine the benefits for the cause of Ukrainian statehood in the international forum that can be derived from the fact of international recognition of the Ukrainian SSR.

Such views were most strongly emphasised in the first two post-war years. Now the fallacy of those considerations is all too obvious, and their spokespersons have cooled in their enthusiasm and rosy hopes that the presence of the Ukrainian SSR on the international chessboard, as a chess piece in the Kremlin's game, would help Ukraine's independent foreign policy work. However, to a large extent, such assumptions remained the basis of an opportunistic concept in Ukrainian political life in exile. The concept of an anti-regime struggle for system change itself continues to be pushed around in the same circle, as does the expressive avoidance of clearly

consistently state that the so-called Ukrainian SSR was not a Ukrainian state.

This is the common denominator of all anti-nationalist tendencies in exile, from explicit socialist, allegedly revolutionary anti-Bolshevik, to pseudo-nationalist. Trying to float to the political surface on the waves of the conjuncture, trying to oppose the nationalist line in Ukrainian independence politics with their "progressive" concept, they actually fall into the old rut of opportunism against the enemy, accepting the hidden intentions of his game in a new, "progressive" edition.

The harmfulness of this direction is multifaceted. First of all, it brings complete confusion to the Ukrainian independence policy, in which the position against the Ukrainian SSR and the whole Bolshevik game in this respect must be fundamentally maintained and consistently pursued. The only correct position is that which corresponds to the actual situation and follows from our main goals. Thus, the Ukrainian SSR is not a Ukrainian state, it is only a signboard, a deceptive form that Bolshevik Moscow is trying to use to hide its imperialist enslavement and colonial exploitation of Ukraine from the outside world. In the eyes of the Ukrainian people, Moscow wants to compromise and devalue the idea of Ukrainian statehood by disguising the worst enslavement and exploitation under the name and form of the Ukrainian SSR. In this way, Bolshevism is trying to undermine and ideologically disarm the struggle for a Ukrainian state. Any opportunism, compromise, or vagueness in this matter is unacceptable in the independence movement, as it causes disorientation and demobilisation, leading to what the enemy wants.

However, Moscow was forced to take this path by the indomitable struggle of the Ukrainian people for state independence. Unable to break it, Bolshevism resorted to deception, to treacherous subversion. However, having done so, the enemy is trying to turn this tactic to its advantage.

By bringing the Ukrainian SSR to the international forum, Bolshevik Moscow wants to achieve several benefits at once: to put Ukraine in the field, to stir up the struggle for full sovereignty, and to deceive the world about the true situation of the so-called Soviet Union republics. In international life, in world opinion, the Bolsheviks are trying to link the name of Ukraine with the whole

Moscow's policy, and not in the sense of enslavement, but only as if the independent Ukrainian SSR voluntarily solidarised with the USSR in everything; in this way, in an international forum, to neutralise, to stifle the truth that Ukraine is the main revolutionary force against Moscow imperialism, that it is struggling to disintegrate, to destroy the USSR; finally, the Bolsheviks are trying to have , very favourable position in their game in international forums. These are the benefits for Bolshevik Moscow.

Is there any benefit for the cause of Ukrainian statehood in the fact that Ukraine is represented by Manuilsky, that the idea of Ukraine as a sub-voice of Moscow is being pushed into the world's consciousness? Wouldn't it be better if the name of Ukraine did not appear as one of the Bolshevik figures, but was solely a synonym and symbol of the anti-Bolshevik and anti-Moscow revolution, which brings about the collapse of the USSR, the defeat of Moscow imperialism, and the death of Bolshevism? Is it better for the word Ukraine to be associated with the uncompromising liberation struggle, and for Moscow to be afraid of the very mention of Ukraine in the world, or for the Manuilskys to represent a settled, obedient Ukraine that the Bolsheviks can safely show to the world? What is more difficult to achieve in an international forum, in the world's eyes: to gain recognition for a real revolution, a crackdown on Bolshevik Moscow - and there is no other way - or to channel and revive all that the so-called Ukrainian SSR has tainted the name of Ukraine with?

Can the so-called continuity of Ukrainian statehood with the Ukrainian SSR as the last flame be of serious importance for the cause of building the USSR? For whose cause is the post-USSR legacy more useful to stretch in the internationally true sense? For the cause of the sovereignty and unity of the Ukrainian state, or for the new Moscow's invasive imperialism? And in general, when, which nation gained or secured its state independence by the most objective rationale of its case before international law? So why should we mislead the independent thought?

And finally, is it reasonable and acceptable to say that the Ukrainian state should voluntarily assume the hypothesis of the Ukrainian SSR, all the obligations and burdens of various kinds that the Bolsheviks have imposed and will impose under the name of the Ukrainian SSR? All the internal and external burdens, and among them, in addition to what has already been done, there may be various treaties,

the martial law of the Ukrainian SSR against other states, .

What kind of independent and even revolutionary policy would it be that is ready to change the general line against a hostile state so quickly and easily due to changes in the political scenery of the enemy? And that is only because it may someday be able to benefit from it.

Attempts to explain the modern liberation struggle to the outside world using the same concept lead to its devaluation. To give the Ukrainian revolution the character of only an anti-regime struggle, a coup d'état, and not of a historical struggle between Ukraine and Russia, is to degrade it in terms of international politics to the quality of such anti-communist forces as, for example, the Russian anti-Bolshevik movement.

Contemporary international life is dominated by a multifaceted conflict between the USSR and the rest of the world. This conflict consists of two main elements: the struggle against communism, which seeks to take over the world, and against Russia's expansionary, aggressive imperialism. These two factors are intertwined, acting along the same line, reinforcing each other. But in their further development, they can exist and act separately, and such a separation will not eliminate either of them. In other words, the elimination of Bolshevism in Russia does not yet bring down Russian imperialism, which can exist and act in a different form, but with the same threat to the outside world. And communism will not completely disappear with its fall in Russia; it can still exist in different countries. In accordance with this, international politics classifies modern anti-Bolshevik forces in terms of their development towards a further goal. They are evaluated according to the line along which they oppose Bolshevism: whether only as an expansionary communism or also as a form of Russian imperialism, and especially whether they will also oppose every advancing Russian imperialism, regardless of the form it takes. The forces that seek the complete destruction of Russian imperialism and prevent its revival have an even different assessment.

When the world understands Ukrainian liberation politics only as a struggle for a coup in the Ukrainian SSR, for the change of the system, the elimination of Bolshevism itself, then it will consider it among the factors that actively oppose Bolshevism, until its collapse, but the role of

of which in further development is not yet determined and may still be different. For our liberation policy, it is important that the Ukrainian liberation revolution be fully assessed as a continuation of Ukraine's historical struggle against Moscow, against Moscow imperialism, and that of all kinds, not just Bolshevik imperialism. This struggle will not stop until our goal is fully realised, which is a complete break between Ukraine and Moscow, the restoration of an independent, united Ukrainian state, the collapse of the USSR and the building of independent, national states in post-Soviet Europe and Asia, the complete defeat of Russian imperialism and the creation of a system of states around Russia, locked within its own borders, so that it can no longer engage in imperialist aggression. And further, to let the world know that Ukraine will continue its struggle against any forces that would want to enslave it, destroy its state independence and sovereignty, or encroach on Ukrainian lands.

With such a correct assessment of its role, Ukraine will be counted in international politics not only as a force in the struggle against Bolshevism, but as a lasting factor opposing all Russian imperialism, as an opponent of all states of enslavement, as an active factor and cornerstone of a whole new way of life in Eastern Europe and in sub-Bolshevik Asia. In this sense, the Ukrainian revolution becomes an agent of far-reaching and lasting change in that space, which will create an entirely new constellation. For such a proper assessment of the Ukrainian case to take hold in international politics, the world needs to see that the Ukrainian national liberation revolution is correspondingly strong and has behind it the readiness and determination of the Ukrainian people to fight along this line to the end, to victory at any cost. The entire revolutionary struggle that is now underway provides adequate proof of this. It also provides the best basis for appropriate foreign policy work.

Ukraine's foreign political action must cope with the task properly. At the same time, it is very important that the formulation of foreign work, the presentation of the general line of liberation policy, be clear and consistent. It is necessary to emphasise as clearly as possible that our struggle is a struggle between Ukraine and Russia, an uncompromising struggle, uninterrupted in historical sequence.

Only for such uncompromising determination, with such a general

This is the line along which our foreign policy can be properly set.

One of the reasons for the promotion of false concepts in Ukrainian politics is the erroneous assessment of the importance of various moments in international relations. Some people still believe that the foreign policy of state nations is guided by ideological motives, that the question of a state's friendly or hostile attitude towards other nations is primarily or largely determined by the similarity or opposition of their state doctrines, systems and social structures. It would be naïve to think that wars, revolutions, antagonisms, alliances, coalitions and all the most important relations between states and peoples, conducted under ideological banners and slogans, actually stem from the motives and seek the goals that are put forward. Some people have lost sight of what is really happening in the world. They do not understand that the main drivers of all international relations are, first and foremost, the struggle of each nation for its own interests, for the acquisition and securing of living space, land, and all the resources necessary for comprehensive development and prosperity, and for the achievement of political, economic, and military security and power, if possible. For imperialist nations, the main driving force is the competition for domination over other nations, in various forms, in order to use their strength and wealth for their own services.

The struggle for the dominance of a particular state and socio-political system in the world, for a particular system in other states and other peoples, is in reality a struggle primarily for the state's own selfish goals, which sets itself up as a selfless defender of this system. Under such screens, there is an attempt to impose its will on the peoples it "converts" to its own way, to "progress", justice, etc, to eliminate the internal order of a given nation that is unfavourable to their intentions, to break down those of its forces that are most unfavourable, most hostile, to assure themselves of the possibility of interfering in internal affairs, to bring it to a state-political or socio-economic system that most favours their own plans against this nation, or indirectly strengthens their own positions, their own system. In some cases, under the guise of intervention against one system and for the introduction of another, there is a simple military aggression, political and economic. The drive to replace one system with another

other peoples, as a rule, serves the state's own goals and, if not only a deception and a cover, then a means to achieve its own goals, brings mediocre benefits.

History clearly demonstrates this. In particular, the international development of recent times, during and after the war, is full of the most damning examples in this regard. First of all, Bolshevism provides a typical example. The world communist revolution, the spread of communism among all peoples, communist action on a global scale - all this is inspired, organised and used by Bolshevism as a tool in the service of Russian imperialism. But also outside of Bolshevism, among its opponents, we find many examples of the use of ideological and altruistic pretexts to cover selfish goals.

Nowadays, the masses of the people play an increasingly active role in political life, wars are becoming more total, covering the whole life, and international relations are so closely intertwined and connected that all changes and games affect many other nations besides the direct participants. At the same time, propaganda is becoming increasingly important in political life in general, including international life, and is gaining enormous proportions, becoming not only a means but also an important factor, a separate area of politics.

Today, more than ever before, there are attempts to conduct policy under such slogans and in such a way that it, regardless of its true content and goals, would appear to be in line with the prevailing views, attitudes and desires of the broad masses of not only their own but also foreign nations.

And just now, in spite of the most diligent propaganda obfuscation of the actual situation, it has become clear that all the great slogans under which the world war and post-war policy were conducted, and which were presented to the masses as the only correct ones, and for which so many victims were laid down, are being treated as tactical means. If it is necessary for the naked politics of interests, then such steps are taken that become a negation of the same lofty slogans and goals. The war against Germany was waged by Western democracies under the slogans of the Charter of Atlanta, in defence of freedom, humanity and democracy, against totalitarianism, dictatorship, violence and enslavement. And their ally in the war was the USSR, where all evils are oppression, poverty, enslavement, terror, totalitarianism, oligarchic dictatorship, extermination of entire peoples, and destruction of religion,

freedom of thought, the eradication of the human and national self, and many other manifestations of extreme barbarism and slavery were brought to the highest degree. The USSR was the main stronghold, model and hotbed of all the evil against which the war was waged. Allied assistance put it back on its feet, made it victorious over its younger brother and pupil in the attempt on the freedom of peoples and man, Hitler's Germany. The alliance with Bolshevik Russia made it a force that threatened the entire world. Moreover, after the war, when the Nazi threat was no longer present, the Bolsheviks sat as judges in an international tribunal to try crimes against humanity and against peace, and they were given the decisive vote (veto) in all international life, in the highest intergovernmental institutions, and they are to decide on all international issues. How can this be reconciled with the slogans under which Western democracies waged war and pursue their policies?

A "way out" was found: the Bolsheviks adopted the same slogans of democracy as their own in order to cynically cover their opposite essence, to beat Western democracy itself with them, and at the same time to completely compromise its slogans, to disarm it ideologically in the subsequent massacre. Initially, the policy of the Western powers found no other way out of the situation created by the military alliance with Russia than to play a good game with the sly and shameless Bolshevik game, to turn a blind eye to the truth about Bolshevik Russia and to pretend to their own peoples and the whole world that they did not see the terrible contradiction between their own slogans and the alliance with the Bolshevik USSR. Only later did Western democracies slowly begin to turn away from that path. To a large extent this was influenced by the Bolshevik offensive against the positions of the Western powers and the obvious further preparation of the USSR's aggression.

Or the policy of the Western democracies towards Tito's Yugoslavia, the clear support, especially economic support, for its Bolshevik regime, is also a classic example of the practical importance attached to what is proclaimed to the world. The Western democracies cannot help but be aware of the real state of affairs in Tito's Yugoslavia, as they have recently spoken out loudly about it. Every citizen of Western countries is well aware that Titov's regime is exactly copied from the Bolsheviks, that it is typically Bolshevik. From a political, socio-economic and every other point of view, Titus's communism in

Yugoslavia is doing exactly the same thing as the USSR. The same terror, totalitarianism, mono-party system, communist collectivisation-socialisation of the entire economy, persecution of religion, forced imposition of a Marxist, materialist worldview, in short a commune that rivals Stalin's "mother" in "achievements" and orthodoxy.

And so, it would be enough for Tito to quarrel with Stalin, to be disobedient to Moscow on the issue of autonomy and incur its wrath, and the Western democracies forget yesterday's great indignation and condemnation of Tito's criminal Bolshevik regime, and give him a full pardon, along with material aid. In the name of what, of what high ideas and principles? Because, hey, maybe Tito will go further down the path of disobedience and self-will towards Moscow, and if Stalin wants to "pacify" "national-communist Yugoslavia", maybe it will put up military resistance. All of this is clearly "pitchforks in the water", and the seriousness and duration of such a family dispute between two totalitarian, fraternal communist regimes is still a big question mark. But the Western powers are helping Titov just in case, hoping that maybe things will turn out the way they would like.

But the cause of the masses has a different, more real page - reality. All the help that Tito receives from the West, he uses well to strengthen the communist system, the communist regime inside the country. Everything is done for internal strengthening, as if to resist Moscow's external onslaught. The only real effect is the consolidation of Bolshevism-communism in the countries moulded into a small USSR - Yugoslavia. To whose disadvantage? Needless to say, first of all, at the expense of greater oppression, the suppression of all independent, anti-communist forces of the peoples enslaved by Tito's Bolshevism. In addition to Tito's regime itself, world communism will benefit from this, because in Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia, communism is strengthening against the national, anti-communist struggles of those peoples, and this is not the first time that it has done so with the material assistance of Western democracies. History repeats itself, some learn, while others try everything again, hoping that maybe this time it will work out differently.

There is no need to puzzle over whether Titus' dispute with Moscow is real or just a cunning, tactical manoeuvre. First of all, we need to look at the facts and the consequences. Even if there is a dispute between Moscow and Titus, between

The enmity between Moscow and the Yugoslav regime will be as intense as that between brothers, and yet there are real facts and clear consequences of the whole development of this situation. First of all, the following: the Western powers favoured Tito's communist regime and provided it with assistance; communism and the Bolshevik system in Yugoslavia changed; the anti-communist struggle was undermined; the ideological positions of Western democracies against totalitarianism, dictatorship, violence, etc. were once again compromised to the extreme; Tito was committed to loyalty to the communist line, and between the USSR and Yugoslavia, there are no real ideological contradictions, a union between them could come at any time and would be more natural than an alliance between communist Yugoslavia and anti-communist states; the dispute over autonomy and subordination would lose its importance in a respectable situation; building more serious political and strategic plans with the expectation of Yugoslavia's participation in the war on the side of the USSR's enemies is too risky.

Or do responsible politicians in Western countries not see or understand all this? It would be ridiculous to assume so. Such a policy is unjustified only in our estimation. But it is being pursued consciously, purposefully, and from their point of view, rationally. In fact, it is their situation that we are considering. It is simple. All this is a side issue for them, a secondary matter. They have already "signed away" Yugoslavia to Bolshevism, and the fate of those peoples who have been thrown to communism as sacrifices is of as much interest to them as the fate of Ukraine and our struggle. All the affairs of the sub-Bolshevik countries are somewhere at the far end of the Western policy agenda. More attention is paid to those loans and shipments that are going to waste. But in comparison, these are not such large sums of money; they can be used to pay for a small checkmate in the so-called Cold War with Moscow, to give the public opinion of their own peoples a kind of soothing pill. They say that the West is on the offensive, making a gap in the enemy's lines, and that if Tito has turned from an outpost to an opponent of Moscow's imperialism and wants to take help from the West, then Western democracy is moving forward! Western politicians do not place a serious stake on Tito, particularly in the strategic sense. This is a side issue, a small bet. They are in the so-called Cold War with the USSR, but they interpret it in a completely different way than the Bolsheviks, in a "colder" way. For the USSR, it is a stage of preparation for the final showdown, a fight with lesser weapons, for more favourable positions in the war. For

For Western powers, the Cold War was a series of manoeuvres, a quest to take up more favourable positions for negotiations with the enemy.

And at the very time when international events are providing such illustrative lectures on "real" politics without scruples, our opportunists of the older and younger political generations, each in their own way, are putting forward the denial of Ukrainian nationalism and the repainting of the liberation movement as the most important thing in foreign policy. Some of them really believe this, while others simply speculate, convincing that the policies of Western countries will be favourable to Ukraine's liberation struggle if we convince the world that we are for democracy. Meanwhile, such issues are of very little importance, and the attitude of outside forces to the cause of Ukraine's liberation and our struggle depends primarily on their current policy towards Russia and their plans for the future. When, from their point of view, there is a coincidence of interests - agreement between the goals of our liberation struggle and the plans of their policy, between the consequences and impact of our struggle and their desires for the development of the situation in our space - then there are real grounds for a positive, favourable attitude of these factors to our struggle. This can be used as a basis not only for appropriate measures to intensify and politically use these opportunities, but also for the broader concept of our foreign policy.

All foreign policy actions on the line of the independence struggle must first of all properly present to the outside world the liberation struggle of Ukraine, its present significance for the general situation, its restraining influence on the growth of Bolshevik power and expansion, its energy aimed at the collapse of the Bolshevik-Russian empire - the prison of the peoples. To make the world aware of the enormous significance of the realisation of the goals of our revolution - the collapse of the USSR, the building of the USSR and other independent national states - for the fundamental change in political, economic and all other relations in Eastern Europe and Asia. To bring all this to the proper knowledge and understanding of other peoples, to arouse their interest and sympathy; to seek understanding and co-operation with such forces whose goals and political line are in line with our goals and our struggle; to take measures to bring to life, on the basis of this real political basis, a relationship between us and these factors that will be useful and will help the struggle now and in the future.

in the future.

Shifting the weight of an independent foreign policy from its real basis to seeking sympathy through consonance in democratic views and attitudes is simply harmful. It deprives our cause of its inherent significance for the outside world, its inherent burden and subject-active role. A foreign policy work that appeals only to ideological similarities, that wants to build everything on sympathy in the name of democratic principles, while giving up the democratic allies of the war (Poland, the Czech Republic, China and others) to Bolshevik Moscow, will not be worthwhile. Such a policy is naive and only compromises itself in the face of the outside world, bringing disorientation and disintegration to its own ranks. It is a manifestation of opportunism and political naivety.

Opponents of Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism are happy to use foreign policy arguments in their opposition to it. They formulate and spread the thesis that the nationalist face of the liberation movement causes many difficulties in foreign policy work and reduces its success. Following the moods and superficial opposition that prevailed after the war, various opportunists thought that all nationalist movements would have to fall under the overwhelming pressure of opposing currents, that there was a trend towards socialism throughout the world. Against this backdrop, opportunism of various origins began to raise its head in Ukrainian political life abroad. In addition to the old trends built on socialist and conciliatory principles, new fellow travellers have emerged who would like to simultaneously speculate on the political conjuncture of the moment, anoint themselves to the revolutionary liberation movement, and even pull it with their own crooked hands. They are trying to instil the concept that our movement must leave its own positions and adapt to the new political wind, adjust to someone else's taste, appropriate various slogans, signs and phraseology borrowed from foreign soil, although all this is meaningless in our current situation.

Throwing out of our ideological and political treasury the values that have grown on our own soil and correspond to our circumstances and needs, and replacing them with values of others,

for other circumstances, which may have been correct, but are now irrelevant for us, can only have a weakening and upsetting effect on our inner life. The very fact that our political content and face are unjustified by our situation, and that we are adapting it to the taste of outside forces, undermines the process of internal growth, confidence in our own strength, the appreciation of our own values, and our basic principle of building liberation only on our own struggle. The fact that old and new opportunists are trying to implant revolutionary, nationalist features into the liberation movement in place of revolutionary, nationalist features, in our current conditions, is devoid of revolutionary content and is reduced to empty, pseudo-democratic phraseology. It is completely inappropriate for organising and conducting the revolutionary liberation struggle, which is the only one that can bring about the liberation of Ukraine.

In addition to their unsuitability and negative impact on the process of internal growth, these tendencies to replace nationalist, revolutionary principles and signs with other, fashionable ones have other harmful aspects. In their design and phraseology, they often resemble Bolshevik "democracy" rather than Western democracy, and coincide with the new Bolshevik fashion of dressing up in democratic colours, and of giving the whole Bolshevik system and policy a democratic sign. Bolshevism uses the brand of anti-fascism and democracy, with the addition of the people's brand, to the fullest extent, referring to the USSR, its entire system and the imperialist campaign of Bolshevism throughout the world.

After the end of the war with Germany and the overthrow of Hitlerism, both the Western powers and the USSR equally presented themselves as democratic. Moreover, for some time, the Western powers did not even deny the democratic nature of the USSR, but took it seriously, only modestly noting their different understanding of democracy. Since the end of the war, a race in democracy has been going on in the world political arena, between Western-style democracy and Bolshevik "people's democracy". It is obvious to anyone with a sober view of the situation that this is merely a Bolshevik propaganda tactic, designed to lure and unite the world's support.

One can only be disgusted by Bolshevik shamelessness when the USSR acts in the posture of democracy, as a spokesperson and defender of "Soviet democracy". But it is equally impossible to accept when the powerful Western powers accepted Bolshevik lies as truth,

knowing full well how things really were, and treated it as the basis of their relations with the USSR and gave it a major role in all international affairs. It is hard to imagine a greater compromise of the concept of democracy than the "democracy" of the USSR and the fact that the states that are the spokesmen for Western democracy, by their tacit consent and whole policy against the USSR, led it into Bolshevism.

- into a community of democratic forces and thus "authorised" and validated the democracy of the USSR. History will duly assess the damage this did to the repulsion of the Bolshevik offensive around the world. Western powers are increasingly experiencing the unfortunate consequences of this policy themselves.

It is also easy to see how this whole international development had a negative impact on the spread of the anti-Bolshevik struggle in the sub-Bolshevik countries. We should not refer to the current situation, which has already changed, but to the state of "cordial friendship in democracy" between the USSR and the Western powers at the end of the war and immediately after it ended.

The Ukrainian liberation movement immediately correctly assessed the nature of Bolshevik "democratic" propaganda and the race in "democracy" between the USSR and Western powers. This was weighed up in the instructions of the OUN Leadership in Ukraine (See: "Resolutions of the Conference of the OUN Leadership in the Ukrainian Lands, held in June 1946" in the collection of documents "OUN in the light of resolutions of the Great Assembly, Conferences and other documents on the struggle of 1929-1955", Library of the Ukrainian Underground, part 1, edition of the OUN Central Committee, 1955, pp. 143 ff.), which provide a holistic assessment of the general political situation and the direction of activity for the entire revolutionary liberation movement. It states that the slogan of democracy has become a subject of political tactics and a means for both rival parties to win over public opinion and the sympathies of the people.

At the same time, since 1945, various opportunists, acting as spokespersons for "democracy", have been trying to drag Ukrainian independence politics into the same game of democracy that is being played on the international forum, in which the USSR is playing one of the first violins. The real reason for this hype about democracy was not the real needs of the Ukrainian liberation movement, but an uncritical perception and misunderstanding of what is actually happening in

international life, tile imitation and a desire to be like the outside world, like current fashion.

Such a worn-out democracy has no true content that would provide a healthy solution to the essential issues of the liberation struggle and the whole of current Ukrainian political life. Leaving aside the theoretical issues of the socio-political system in their own country, this democracy often has the character of empty declarations, similes, and in more than one case, demagoguery. Due to this internal emptiness and artificial falsity, detachment from the real political reality and focus on foreign policy effect, the pseudo-democratic phraseology of our opportunists has a character and expression similar to Soviet "democracy". This similarity is completed by the same terminology: "people's democracy". Thus, although the pursuit of external democratic fashion stems from the desire to resemble and be liked by Western democracy, the internal essence of this resemblance comes out and results in an analogy to Bolshevik "democratisation" rather than Western democracy.

These are the motivations behind various attempts to make the slogan "for democracy" or "for a democratic system in Ukraine" the banner of the Ukrainian revolutionary and liberation struggle against Bolshevism. It might have appealed to some outside political factors who are not familiar with the historical problems of the liberation struggle of the peoples of post-Soviet Europe and Asia, and who judge everything on the basis of external signs and names. It is possible that the calculation of a cheap effect to appeal to such factors may seem reasonable to some. But this is in the realm of empty phrases, bare verbal statements and sympathies, not real, effective policy. To build on such factors is to deceive oneself.

Instead, the change of flags, the change of the leading idea of the liberation struggle, has a very significant negative impact on the development and success of this struggle. And we must take this point into account. As well as every serious outsider who looks at the essence, not the superficial impression, and who will interpret our situation with understanding.

As noted earlier, since the Second World War,

The Bolsheviks took the screen of democracy, popular democracy, as their main sign, their main slogan. Under this slogan, they are waging their imperialist offensive on a global scale, for the defeat of everything opposed, for the conquest of the world. Every Bolshevik campaign, every single action along these lines, directed against the Menshevik outside forces, is conducted under this slogan. All Bolshevik propaganda is laced with the term democracy, democratic in the sense that there is real democracy in the USSR and its satellites, only the Bolshevik system is democratic, only the USSR is fighting for democracy around the world, for true, popular democracy. This is enough to make those slogans from Bolshevik lips, which always ring in the ears of all the sub-Soviet world, all peoples, and every sub-Soviet person, empty, meaningless, or even disgusting because of the Bolshevik taste that has already stuck to them.

At the same time, on the emigrant basis, there are attempts to impose the slogan "for democracy" on the liberation struggle as a banner slogan; to lead the revolution under it, to mobilise the masses for the most difficult life-or-death struggle against Bolshevism. This means depriving the liberation revolution of its own, clear ideological face, its own distinctive battle cries and banners, and replacing them with those that the enemy has put up as its own. This means, on the ideological front, to reach a state of affairs that exists, for example, between Western democracies and the USSR, when both use the slogan of democracy, and both sides speak in their propaganda of their real democracy and the enemy's false one. Or like between socialism and communism: both are red, both are for socialism, etc.

Who is looking for this kind of muddling of the fronts? The Bolsheviks, of course. Because they do not want to lose the ideas and slogans of their opponents, they intercept them and appropriate them for themselves, just as they do with weapons in war. Instead, they have their own ideas, slogans, and concepts, which are their own piercing weapons. On the ideological front, which is of paramount importance in the revolutionary struggle, it is very important to use different types of weapons appropriately. We need to use every weapon that is suitable for defeating the enemy, and we have available to us. But we need to know and calculate the effect of each one and use it accordingly. We need to distinguish between those that serve defence, those that paralyse the enemy's offensive, and those that

defence, which prepares the offensive, and which creates the main means of the offensive itself. Between ideas and slogans, we must distinguish between those that have universal significance, which we accept and use in the same way as other forces. These include slogans of democracy and various universal ideas, cries. We distinguish from them such cries that give the most essential and very specific meaning to our own goals, and therefore are our specific, flagship cries. They give a clear ideological face and concrete content to our struggle, they are the way in which we are recognised by our own and others, and they must be followed by the masses, the whole nation, amidst the ideological confusion that Bolshevik propaganda deliberately creates around universal ideas, in particular around the slogans of democracy.

Our flag slogans are unchanged: the general slogan "freedom for peoples, freedom for man" goes along with very specific ones: "for an independent, united Ukrainian state", "for the complete destruction of Bolshevism, communism and all Russian imperialism", "for the collapse of the USSR and for independent national states in its place". This is followed by programme slogans that specify the content of independent state life in all areas, define the principles of the state system, the socio-political and economic order, and the principles of development and ordering of individual spheres of life. These programmatic principles-slogans of Ukrainian nationalism contain the principles of Ukrainian democracy, or rather democracy in the essential, not in the stencil-propaganda sense of the word. However, they come after the main goal - the restoration of the USSR - and should always be put in this order.

Various opponents of the Ukrainian nationalist movement are trying not only to monopolise the slogans of democracy, which they interpret as a means of their own opportunistic speculation, but also to portray our movement as opposed to democracy, to tarnish it by accusing it of being related to totalitarian systems. This demagogic, tendentiously false staging is based on the groundless thesis that there is a contrast between the principles of Ukrainian nationalism, as the OUN has always understood, interpreted and implemented it, on the one hand, and the principles of democracy in the correct, healthy sense, on the other. This deliberately ignores the fact that the Ukrainian revolutionary nationalist movement in its entirety is a national movement,

that its main goals are to gain freedom for the entire Ukrainian people, freedom in every respect, national, state and social, to ensure free comprehensive development, to make the Ukrainian people the masters of their own land, exercising power and deciding all their affairs. The entire Ukrainian nation is the subject and the target of Ukrainian nationalism. The best possible, all-round development of all forces and parts of the Ukrainian nation, freedom and real justice for all citizens of Ukraine are the main lines of its programme. An independent, united Ukrainian state, freedom for the peoples and the individual - these are the main goals of the nationalist movement's struggle, formulated in a short, main cry.

Free development, expression of thought and creativity in all areas, freedom of individual and collective, organised activity, free existence and activity of diverse organisations, including public, professional associations and political parties, equality of all citizens of Ukraine, ensuring adequate living standards and welfare for all, ensuring that each individual has an equal start in life, comprehensive development and expression of abilities, access to all schools and ranks

- These are some of the many programmatic postulates that are the conclusions of the basic premise of the nationalist movement that in the Independent Ukrainian State there will be an order of freedom and justice, welfare and prosperity of all forces of the nation, all citizens.

But the Ukrainian nationalist movement is first and foremost a liberation movement. Its main purpose and content is to bring about the liberation, state sovereignty and unity of Ukraine through its own revolutionary struggle. In accordance with this, our ideology and programme formulate and emphasise various points from the perspective of the liberation struggle, rather than purely theoretical, unfounded declarations and declarations, or simply speculation on the conjuncture, as all parties allow themselves to do. Our concept of liberation is a concept of action, of struggle, so our programme reflects not only the importance but also the effective alternation of our goals. Without own state, without liberation, and therefore without the liberation struggle, Ukraine can have neither freedom nor prosperity, nor any shadow of democracy. Therefore, any rearrangement of this order of things in the sphere of concepts leads to confusion, and in the sphere of political action - to undermining the nation's liberation struggle.

The extremely cunning and well-disguised manoeuvres of the Bolshevik

propaganda, their successes - penetrating the politics and attitudes of different peoples, complicating those politics and attitudes with good intentions - can only be seen and properly appreciated if we delve deeper into the nature, purpose and consequences of the phenomena that originate from Bolshevism and are adopted by other peoples. In order to illuminate these Bolshevik methods, the susceptibility of Western democracies and some Ukrainian milieus to them, and to show how small manifestations often conceal very important matters, let us examine one of these countless facts more closely. For example, let's take the seemingly insignificant, but significant and deeply significant fact that Hitlerism is not called by its proper name, national socialism, but only Nazism. This is what Bolshevik propaganda consistently does, without using the name national socialism, but only calling Hitlerism Nazism or fascism. Because when Bolshevism realises socialism, it cannot beat it. Both Bolsheviks and socialists of various stripes want to obscure the fact that Hitlerism was called and was National Socialism. Why? So that the shame and curse that national socialism brought upon itself through its practice does not affect socialism, but falls on every nationalism, without regard to its inner content, essence and nature. This is what our social opportunists and the part of the Western opposition, which has been corrupted by socialism and communism, uncritically accepts Bolshevik suggestions, do.

Hitlerism had two main elements: German racism-imperialism and national socialism. National Socialism's attitude to all other peoples was determined by imperialist racism, the theory of the superiority of the German race, its right and natural destiny to dominate other peoples, to harness them to its services, to take away their land, property, strength and creativity, and to destroy other races. If someone wants to look for analogies, they can do so among those nations whose history and present, the conquest of other nations, the building of multinational empires, colonies, etc. provide grounds for this. We see many similarities in Moscow's imperialism. It takes Bolshevik demagoguery and shamelessness to talk about the similarities with Hitler's National Socialism of Ukrainian nationalism, which fights for the destruction of imperialism, the liberation of Ukraine and other peoples, for the independent life and free development of the Ukrainian nation, which puts the ethnographic principle and the principle of free state self-determination of peoples as one of the main principles in international relations.

relationships.

The other main element of Hitlerism is national socialism as a system of the internal order of the German people, the German Reich.

In its spirit and practice, it followed in the footsteps of Bolshevism in many ways. The totalitarian system, the dictatorship and arbitrariness of the state bureaucracy, the complete disregard for human beings, the system of reckless terror, such means as concentration camps, the mass extermination of disobedient elements - all this National Socialism took over from Bolshevism. Both have the same practice, with which the one carries out Marxist socialism-communism, and the other - national socialism. Similarly, in the attitude to religion, in the spiritual, cultural and educational spheres, there is a great deal of similarity between national socialism and national socialism in practice, although both in their theory take opposite positions in many matters.

Hitlerism clearly proclaimed its imperialism in the form of racist theory.

Bolshevism conceals its Moscow imperialism under the guise of internationalism, class solidarity of the proletariat, and world communist revolution. The whole opposition between them, from the ideological beginning to the military, was essentially a competitive struggle between two similar imperialisms for domination of the same space, not a struggle between two opposing worldviews, ideologies, and socio-political systems.

Having examined the history and essence of German National Socialism and Moscow Social Communism, placed side by side, we come to the conclusion that socialism, both international and national, finding a suitable basis in a nation, leads to totalitarianism with all its methods and consequences. And the second conclusion is that socialism is not in any way opposed to imperialism, enslavement, violence, does not take under its protection either peoples or human beings, and can be a very good tool for imperialism, enslavement, tyranny, exploitation, extermination of peoples and human beings. And third. - Socialism is not an opposition to all capitalism, it only overcomes the private capitalist system, but leads to state capitalism, which most oppresses, exploits and enslaves the people, and above all the workers and peasants. In this way, socialism ultimately tightens the most terrible noose around the neck of those it purports to protect.

Similarly, the example of Tito's Yugoslavia clearly shows that Serbian national communism in its domestic policy is no different from Russian Bolshevism. In both, as in Hitlerism, there is total enslavement, terror, exploitation and slavery of peoples and human beings, persecution of religion, all those national, spiritual, cultural, political and social primordia that do not submit to, serve or assist the dominant, violent system. National communism leads to the same thing as international communism.

There was one phenomenon in Ukrainian political life that clearly indicates that the concept of national communism was a point of convergence between Moscow Bolshevism and Hitler's National Socialism. In 1940-41, when the question of war or peace between Nazi Germany and the USSR was being decided and both sides were preparing for reprisals on all fronts, an anonymous initiative appeared among Ukrainian citizens on the western outskirts and in exile, including in the so-called Governor-General's Office, and a political novelty was published, as if it were a conspiratorial "Ukrainian National Communist Army".

Few people know that this was an inspiration, a Hitlerite attempt made by Ukrainian hands. This work was carried out by a few individuals who were ready to serve others, including those who had previously played prominent roles in Ukrainian political life. But the most interesting thing is that, in addition to the Nazis, the Bolsheviks also contributed to the emergence of the UNKA, because some of the Ukrainians who initiated the UNKA had long been in the service of Bolshevik intelligence and maintained secret contacts with the Bolshevik embassy in Berlin. At that time, the attempt to launch the Ukrainian national-communist movement was equally beneficial to Berlin and Moscow. It would have been most convenient for the Nazis to take over Ukraine by preserving the communist system, redrawing it slightly, adding the sign "Ukrainian national communism", and returning all the achievements of perfect communist exploitation to the Reich, for the eternal enslavement of Ukraine. Again, Moscow wanted the communist system to remain in place even under German occupation in the event of the Bolsheviks' retreat from Ukraine, so that the people would see its "irreplaceability" and make it even easier for the Bolsheviks to reestablish their rule. Prudent politics is also for the worse. The UNCA attempt remained stillborn because it did not find any response; its creators

remained in the shadows, did not reveal their anonymity, and continued to quietly "work" in Rosenberg's Ostministerium, in the Teshtapo, and some simultaneously in the Bolshevik agents.

The episode with the UNKA is very instructive; on the one hand, it reveals Bolshevik moves, and on the other hand, it reveals the true relationship between the Bolsheviks and National Socialism, the line of their intersection. The Bolsheviks continue this line of work with their agents and sabotage among other nations. This can be clearly seen in political life in exile, where attempts to inculcate communist tendencies, sentiments, and sympathies in a disguised form as a national or even anti-Bolshevik screen are repeated and intensified. The same is happening among other nations. In particular, a great manoeuvre is being made to push and inculcate the concept of "titoism - national communism" into the politics of Western democracies. In this form, communism should find less resistance and even support from Western democracies. The rest will come later. Moscow knows how to assess the ideological drivers in the lives of peoples, it gives due weight to the communist ideology and system, and it is betting that the peoples and communist states that have been mastered by communism will have to side with the USSR in the final showdown between the two worlds - communist and anti-communist. And the Bolsheviks will make sure that the coming war will have a distinct ideological face on their side. This will give it the character of an ideological war even if the other side does not have a clear, unanimous ideological front.

Completely compromised National Socialism, falling in the aftermath of the war, was supposed to drag down its elder brother and master, Bolshevism. With it had to go the whole of materialist socialism, which, speculating on the high, healthy idea of social justice, the free and full development of all the forces of the people, the will, dignity and well-being of man, equality and brotherhood, that is, on the idea of Christianity, led the healthy aspirations of peoples and their forces down the path of class struggle, the decomposition of nations and undermined the entire European spirit.

It was precisely because of this decline in Christianity, ideological purity, clarity and farsightedness of political thought, a sense of great historical responsibility on the one hand, and the threat of Stalin's union with Hitler on the other, that the conduct of the war by the Western allies went

in such a way that Hitlerism fell and Bolshevism emerged victorious and became an even greater threat to the whole world. This half-hearted conclusion, that Bolshevism remained, strengthened by the growth of parts of the potential that Hitlerism had at its disposal, is not a positive solution to the history of the struggle of our time. This competition will continue until it unfolds into a new world war.

Meanwhile, Bolshevism, being on the offensive, having the initiative, and above all, having overt and covert, conscious and unconscious helpers in the Western world, managed to sow such confusion in the tile opposition of the world that the ideological bankruptcy of National Socialism, which is in essence a mediocre historical condemnation of the Bolshevik system itself, turned out to be to Bolshevism's advantage.

Bolshevik propaganda, with the cooperation of socialist influences, made every effort to divert the pressure of the moral and political offensive against National Socialism around the world from Bolshevism. This great manoeuvre of Bolshevik Moscow on the ideological front was largely successful. For a while, much of the political energy and opposition mobilised by the war chased the shadows of National Socialism in a false direction. Meanwhile, the second, even greater perpetrator, Bolshevism, cynically continued its craft from the position of judge and world peacemaker and prepared further attacks. The political thought and energy of the peoples, thrown into an empty field, was confused and exhausted. Today, it has to be mobilised anew and directed against the main enemy, now a single enemy, but with difficulty and with the loss of time and many positions. Meanwhile, Bolshevism is advancing and gaining ground. The events in China, no less important and far-reaching in their consequences than the events of the Second World War, significantly strengthen the balance of power in favour of the USSR. Bolshevism's war against the world continues, albeit in different forms.

The peoples enslaved or directly attacked by Bolshevism, Ukraine being in the first place, are waging their defensive or liberation struggle. There is no peace and there will be no peace until the final showdown between the two worlds - between Moscow's Bolpievism and freedom-loving peoples. The current situation is a break, a silence on a large front, preparations for a big battle on both sides. Public opinion is focused on occasional outbursts or various tactical attempts and conflicts. Meanwhile, important movements are taking place behind the scenes, under their cover,

movements that will decide future major battles. Securing the most favourable ideological and political positions and the same weapons, putting the enemy in an uncomfortable position, gaining allies, neutralising actual or potential enemies - all this is in the first place at this stage, along with military preparations for war.

Opposed to the nationalist liberation concept, the concept of anti-regime resistance alone has another fundamental, wrong and harmful basis. Supporters of anti-regime resistance alone fight only against Bolshevism and its imperialism, not against Russia, and certainly not against the Russian people. Because, they say, Bolshevism and Russian imperialism are supposedly separated from the Russian people, who are not responsible for its imperialism, do not want it, do not support it, but, on the contrary, want to overthrow it. This line should be pursued in all political work among the Ukrainian people and presented to the outside world.

Instead, our general line of liberation policy is based on the fact that the struggle for Ukraine's state independence is a struggle against Russia, not only against Bolshevism, but against every form of invasive Russian imperialism that has been inherent in the Russian people throughout history and now. If tomorrow Bolshevism is replaced by another form of Russian imperialism, it will also turn its full force against Ukraine's independence and enslavement. The Russian people, as before, will carry that imperialism and do everything to keep Ukraine enslaved. This is clearly indicated by the state of political thought and the attitude of the Russian masses, all Russian political environments, both communist and anti-Bolshevik. All of them are extremely hostile to the idea of state separateness and sovereignty of Ukraine. Vlasovshchyna is an eloquent example of what post-Bolshevik Moscow will use against Ukraine.

Thus, Ukraine's struggle for its freedom and independence is, first and foremost, a struggle against the offensive of imperialist Moscow. And because that invasive imperialism is invariably borne and continued by the Russian people, our struggle is and will be Ukraine's struggle against Russia.

In its political propaganda work among Russians, the Russian people, and the Soviet army, the Liberation Movement tries to paralyse and blunt the hostility and aggressiveness of the Russian masses against the Ukrainian independence movement, tries to bring about political demobilisation in the enemy camp, to stir up and strengthen anti-Bolshevik sentiment, forces, and actions in the Russian people, and to strengthen anti-imperialist tendencies in them, if they exist. It goes without saying that, when addressing a hostile environment, we should speak in such a way as to arouse a willingness to listen, to accept our arguments, and not to be negative.

In fact, there is no contradiction between the line of our propaganda and policy on the Russian section between what we say to Russians and what we do in our struggle, in our internal activities, and what we stand for to the outside world. In everything we stand on the ground of reality. In the form of statements, we present what exists in reality.

We point out all the negative consequences for the people themselves of Bolshevism and imperialism, the common misery and suffering that Bolshevism brings not only to the enslaved peoples, but also to the Russian people. And everything that refers to the negative attitude of the masses of the Russian people to Bolshevism and Russian imperialism, their struggle against it, the common front and good neighbourly relations between the Ukrainian people and the Russian people - all this has the character of wishes, appeals, and proposals to the Russian environment.

The opposite concept wants to stick to the line of anti-Bolshevik struggle in political and educational work among the Ukrainian people, to direct all the attention and revolutionary attitude of the Ukrainian masses exclusively against the regime itself and against the current form of Moscow imperialism - Bolshevism. The claim is being made that the Russian people themselves are also fighting Bolshevism, suffering from it, and, with the exception of a small imperialist Bolshevik clique, are not our enemy but our friend and ally. This direction leads to the strengthening by Ukrainian hands of what Moscow Bolshevism is trying to achieve in the first place

- to kill the Ukrainian people's national instinct, correct understanding of the essential meaning of events, to kill self-defensive, irreconcilable attitudes towards Russia; to turn them into political Little Russians, only in a new "Ukrainian" form.

Some people think that in this way it is possible to achieve concentration and thus greater intensification of hatred and hostility against the current most formidable manifestation of Moscow imperialism - Bolshevism. Meanwhile, this is not the case. If the sense of recognising the enemy wherever he is is dulled, and seeing him only from one side, in one appearance, then it makes it easier for him to attack from other sides in other clothes. And this offensive against Ukrainians is being waged by the invading Moscow in many different guises, not only in Bolshevik form.

If the Bolsheviks had really been able to instil in the Ukrainian people an attitude of "big brother", a theory of common historical roots, a kindred spirit, a belief in the goodwill and sincerity of the Russian people towards Ukraine, admiration for Russian culture, belief in its superiority, perfection, desire to learn from Russia, to be like it, and other such weaknesses, this would bind Ukraine to Russia more firmly and permanently than the strongest political connection, stronger than any terror. This is complemented by the consistent, increasingly strong, total linking of Ukraine's economy to Moscow's, and the placing of this principle at the heart of the entire Soviet economic system. It is guided not by economic but rather by political rationales, so that in time Ukraine's separation from Russia would be economically impossible or very difficult, so that Ukraine's economy would automatically stop flowing when Moscow stops the blood circulation in the relevant arteries, or when they are interrupted by Ukraine's separation from Moscow.

The Bolsheviks are trying to drug the political thinking of Ukrainians with the illusion that through unification with Russia, Ukraine, the Ukrainian people, the Ukrainian person have all the opportunities for broad growth open to them, and benefit from the achievements and power of an entire empire. With such illusions, created by propaganda, they want to kill the feeling and understanding of the reality that Ukraine is only a colony of Moscow, that the Ukrainian people are slaves for Russia, suppliers of human power, brains, hands and holes; that Ukrainian culture is robbed of all its achievements and deprived of the possibility of growth, that Ukrainian forces are harnessed to creative labour for Russia or exterminated; that the Ukrainian person is totally enslaved.

The door is open to those who will sacrifice their national self, their honour, their knowledge, skills, creativity, labour and blood for the service

Russian Empire. Moscow is making every possible effort to kill the perception of this reality in our people and to inculcate Soviet thinking and Soviet patriotism.

On this basis, Moscow wants to build on Ukraine's continued subordination to Russia, and even more so on its perpetual de-muscovisation. All means of violence and terror are aimed at making a tamed Ukraine fall at Moscow's feet. Russia's main goal is to annex Ukraine, so that the Ukrainian people, having sacrificed their national nature, their self, do not consider slavery to be slavery, but accept it as their natural position, love it. These are the final plans of Russia of all, which the Bolsheviks have been implementing all along, with the greatest stubbornness and consistency. This is the main front of the historical competition between Ukraine and Moscow, and a breakthrough on it is the most dangerous.

On the Ukrainian side, there is a stubborn struggle - a fightback. On this front, most of the victims, the most valuable creative forces of Ukraine, have fallen. The fighters for the Ukrainian spirit, for the Ukrainian content of individual areas of life and creativity, who nurture, elevate, preserve and disseminate the values of the Ukrainian nation, and oppose them to the imposition of Russian-Sovietness, are rendering great services to preserve the independence and further development of the Ukrainian nation.

In the political struggle, in which the whole of the Ukrainian struggle is concentrated, special attention must be paid to this front. In the liberation revolution, all struggle and activity on the internal, Ukrainian segment must be directed in such a way as to strengthen and sharpen in all areas the front line between Ukraine and Moscow, between Ukrainianness, the Ukrainian spirit and content, and Russia. The Ukrainian nationalist movement must mobilise, organise, ideologically content and direct, and effectively consolidate all forms of defensive struggle against the Russian offensive in all its forms. It must clearly implement an uncompromising stance in the total struggle against Russia, in repulsing its total offensive. In particular, the nationalist movement must speak out sharply, awaken national sensitivity and resilience where it is waning, where the enemy has managed to put it to sleep or stifle it, and where important issues of Ukraine's struggle against Moscow, essential matters of independent life and development of the nation come into play.

It is in the opposite direction that the opportunistic, opportunistic concept goes - to put the liberation struggle on such a platform that it is not Russia or the Russian people who are the Isorcus of Ukraine's independence, but a separate Bolshevik imperialism. Socialism has already served the liberation cause with a similar political line.

The Ukrainian nationalist movement, having become the leader of the liberation struggle, must correct previous mistakes and overcome the recurrence of historical weaknesses and mismanagement.

Pure Ukrainian nationalism, untainted by cunning and compromises with evil, will emerge victorious from the difficult but majestic struggle against satanic Bolshevik Moscow. It will win, because it contains the great Truth of the Ukrainian nation, according to God's laws, the life of peoples and people in freedom and justice. And the Ukrainian people have been fighting for this truth throughout their history. From generation to generation, the best sons and daughters of the Ukrainian people have dedicated their lives to the service of this truth, giving their lives in the struggle for it.

Now, Ukraine's historic struggle for truth is reaching its peak, its greatest intensity and size. The struggle encompasses a lifetime, and the whole nation is competing.

Ukrainian nationalists are confident in the victory of Ukraine. Faith gives us unshakable confidence - faith in God, faith in the Ukrainian nation, in its truth. Loyalty to the idea of Ukrainian nationalism is the greatest strength of the Ukrainian liberation revolution, which be broken by any means, even by an enemy such as Bolshevik Moscow.

## **On the tenth anniversary of the creation of the revolutionary leadership of the OUN (10.2.1940)**

*"The explanation of yesterday serves to clarify today and sheds light on the germs of tomorrow's events in Ukrainian political life" - these final words of the article "On the Tenth Anniversary..." also explain the reasons for its writing. After 10 years, the time has come to clarify not only for OUN members, but also for Ukrainian citizenship, why the bifurcation between nationalists came about, why the OUN Revolutionary Leadership was called upon, and what paths the work and struggle of the Organisation of Ukrainian*

*Nationalists in the years to come. By revealing many unknown facts, Stepan Bandera also gave direction for the future.*

*The article "On the Tenth Anniversary of the Establishment of the OUN Revolutionary Leadership" was published, signed by Stepan Bandera, in the magazine "Surma", Munich, chapters 18-19, February-March 1950, and in the weekly "The Future of Ukraine", Toronto, year iii, chapters. 21/56 - 23/58, June 1950.*

On 10 February, ten years passed since the turning point in the development of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists and the entire revolutionary liberation movement. At a meeting of the OUN's leading activists, the Revolutionary Leadership of the OUN was called to life and the temporary leadership of the Organisation was transferred to it. This act unraveled the knot of deep ideological, political and organisational differences between: the overwhelming majority of the Organisation, primarily its revolutionary activists from the native lands, on the one hand, and Andriy Melnyk's OUN and supporters of his line, on the other.

iii. In the spring of 1941, the Grand Assembly of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists approved the act of 10. 2. 1940, recognised it as necessary and correct, approved the activities of the Provisional Revolutionary Leadership, called the new OUN Leadership into being, confirmed the illegitimacy of the so-called Great Assembly held in 1939 and the illegitimacy of the appointment of Andriy Melnyk as the Head of the OUN. The Second Great Gathering of the OUN condemned the further activities and performances of Andrii Melnyk's group under the name of the OUN as sabotage.

Act of 10 February 1940 and ii. The Great Assembly of the OUN completed the process of crystallisation within the Organisation, established the nationalist, revolutionary direction of the liberation movement and the line of a completely independent policy, free from external orientations. Those elements who, by virtue of various circumstances, found themselves in the Organisation, but who were opposed to the nationalist and revolutionary line, and tried to lead the movement down steep roads of different orientations and opportunistic combinations, ended up outside its organised ranks. The fact that Andriy Melnyk' group continued to act under the name of the OUN does not change the fact that it conceptually and effectively stood in the camp of opponents of the OUN, the entire nationalist, revolutionary and liberation movement, in the socialist-conciliar camp, following its own nature, not its political pedigree or name.

The Ukrainian nationalist, revolutionary and liberation movement, formed by the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, grew organically out of two main elements: nationalist ideology and revolutionary action, uncompromising armed struggle for state independence on the part of the Ukrainian Military Organisation. Initially, both of these elements were not fully covered. The armed revolutionary struggle of the UVO was initially only a continuation of the military struggle against the occupiers of Ukraine in other forms. Under the ideological, political, and conceptual perspective, it reflected and lived the same heterogeneous, often opposing elements as in 1917-1920. The very nature of the revolutionary struggle imposed a categorical requirement on the liberation movement to create a monolithic, effective force, to deploy the revolutionary struggle as a unanimous, comprehensive spiritual, socio-political and military process, guided by one overarching ideology, a liberation political and strategic concept and a single organisational system. Otherwise, there was no hope of maintaining and continuing the revolutionary struggle.

On the other hand, the same conclusions and postulates were reached by deeper political reflections, analysis of the internal causes that led to the breakdown of state independence, the maturation of national political consciousness, and the beginning of the crystallisation of the Ukrainian

nationalism. Thus, the Ukrainian independence and liberation movement in the Native Lands crystallised as a nationalist and revolutionary movement. The nationalist ideology, political concept, nationalist direction and content of the struggle were embodied in the organisational and operational system of the military revolutionary organisation.

This process took place in the native lands quickly and deeply, under the pressure of the demands of life and the sharpened political instinct of the people.

Creator and Leader of the revolutionary liberation movement, sb. Sven Konowalec had a full understanding of the nature and importance of that process, and he led that process. Abroad, this process did not take place with the same speed and depth as in his native lands. There was no direct influence of the struggle of life itself and the natural selection that takes place in it. After the death of the Rev. Svhen Konovalets, in the foreign circles of the Organisation, and in the OUN itself, there rose such tendencies and elements that were subordinate to the nationalist direction of the late Leader of the movement, but did not accept it internally. From an ideological, programmatic, and political point of view, these were not homogeneous elements, nor was there a single crystallised current. What they had in common was that they found themselves in the nationalist movement (some of them in leading positions), having been part of the various groups that merged into it, but they themselves did not undergo the organic process of ideological and political crystallisation, the solidification that the movement as a whole underwent. They remained in the movement as a mechanical hit.

The following categories can be distinguished among them: The tendency to limit the revolutionary liberation movement to the most technical, revolutionary military action, as was the case in the UVO at the beginning, and to leave politics to other factors, which was trampled on by spokesmen for other tendencies who themselves had a commitment to political action, were politicians, and not militants, but at the same time gravitated towards existing political groups, were guided by them, and had explicit or implicit intentions to bring the "de-politicised" revolutionary movement, narrowed to military and technical functions, under the political leadership of their orientations. In this category, supporters of the UNR group were the most numerous and politically active in the Organization's foreign circles, just as earlier in the ZUS there had been strong attempts in the UVO to bring it under the political leadership of Galician parties, UNDOs and radicals, and tendencies

were completely overcome by the thirties. The supporters of the UNR group within the OUN did not explicitly express their tendencies, given that in the Native Lands the Wiener-Socialist camp was then completely compromised and most unreceptive.

Similar motivations guided those elements who held on to the revolutionary liberation movement as a dynamic, active and strong factor in the Ukrainian world, and who were guided various foreign policy combinations and games. For them, the internal ideological and political content of our movement was indifferent or secondary. They interpreted the revolutionary force and struggle primarily as a factor that the outside world could reckon with, and from which they could speak and negotiate with external factors.

They put their money on the foreign policy map, on agreements with external forces, on the inclusion of our struggle in international political and military games and conflicts, on the full support of our struggle by outside forces.

In our movement's vision, the foreign policy work of the masses is important because it gains supporters, sympathy and support for Ukraine's liberation struggle from other nations. But it still comes second to our own struggle and building our own strength. This was the position of the nationalists who acted on the outside, recognising a single concept - their own strength. At the same time, for some of these figures, their own struggle was only a platform, a means for external political activity. With this tendency, its supporters found it disadvantageous that the liberation movement had its own crystallised ideology and political concept, which determined the firm line of the whole policy, including foreign policy, and it seemed to them that it was more convenient to act as a militant revolutionary movement without a distinct political face, because this gave them greater opportunities to manoeuvre and adapt to external forces and circumstances.

Finally, there were those who lived by ideological and programmatic concepts that were completely different from the nationalist ones. In particular, they were socialist in content, though without an expressive name. These were people could not, or did not want to, or did not know how to get rid of the long-standing ideological and political principles from the repertoire of socialist and Marxist parties. They were trying to change their beliefs

to instill the whole movement.

Thus, all these movements and units, despite their heterogeneity, had one thing in common, which brought them to the same attitude, to common efforts: dissatisfaction with the fact that the revolutionary liberation movement crystallised as a nationalist movement, clearly defined ideologically and politically.

After the hostile Rotterdam attack on the heart of the Ukrainian nationalist, liberation movement, all such tendencies in the OUN's foreign leading circles were revived, activated, and raised their heads. In the OUN and Andriy Melnyk's group, they prevailed, and their common tendency was to carry out a turning in the Organisation. Some tried to move the movement from the scale of the OUN back to the original scale of the UVO, while others simply took up the task of moving the movement to other, non-nationalist ideological and political positions.

But it was already useless. The entire liberation and revolutionary movement and the OUN were already completely one and the same. The OUN had already established a nationalist content that had entered the blood of its revolutionary, fighting cadres and its entire action, so that it was impossible to change it without a major coup. Any direct attempts had to lead to an explosion and their elimination outside the movement. And covert efforts in that direction had no prospect of success, because the Organisation, in the process of ideological and political crystallisation and the struggle for it, had developed a very sharp instinct to that effect. The nationalist idea was not only the driving force but also the guiding force of the Movement. Therefore, there could be only one nationalist leadership. No substitute could stand in its place. Andriy Melnyk and his OUN faced a historical requirement to lead the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, its life, development, activities, politics and struggle according to its principles, along its own line. If this was not the case, then this anomaly had to be eliminated or corrected in one way or another.

The creation of the OUN Revolutionary Leadership, which took over the helm of its activities, and later, by the resolutions of the Second Great Assembly of the OUN, approved the ideological content and political direction of the revolutionary liberation movement, eliminated from its ranks those tendencies and elements that tried to direct it to other paths or impose a reverse

development process.

Now, in the decade of the act of 10. 2. 1940, it is no longer necessary to explain and prove that the removal of the Melnyk group from the OUN stemmed from deep and significant ideological and political-conceptual differences, that it was not a matter of secondary, but of primary issues of the internal content of the liberation movement and the ways of its struggle at an important historical moment. Only at the beginning, in 1940-41, was there ambiguity in Ukrainian political life and among the citizenry on this issue. It was created primarily by the fact that Andriy Melnyk's group continued to act under the name of the OUN, disguising its true ideological and political direction.

On the other hand, the situation was also obscured by the fact that only a few reasons were presented to the public in the coverage of this event. It was about ideological differences, which were properly assessed only within the Organisation itself, and to the wider public they seemed to be theoretical matters, not questions of the direction of live political action. Also, matters of trust and internal organisational morale and order were of secondary importance to the wider citizenship. Instead, the fundamental questions of the Organization's policy in the then emerging general situation, which cut short such a radical outcome, at that time and in that form, remained unknown to the citizenship, and even to the Organization. Only a small number of members knew the details.

This was because the sharpest differences related to the plans for the further development of the revolutionary struggle in the new political situation and to the policy of the Organisation in relation to the then existing and emerging international events. The plans of the Organisation in this respect could not be disclosed, as this would have made it largely impossible to implement them. Such plans could not be presented in the face of the Bolshevik enemy, nor in the face of Nazi Germany, which was still hiding its plans for the "East" at the time, but was already trying to influence the development of internal Ukrainian relations and forces in the direction it desired. Therefore, it was necessary to keep the most important differences and the meaning of the events temporarily closed to the public.

We had to give up on the fact that the coming events would reveal the true essence, content and causes of the conflict, and would show us where the real OUN and its substitute in name, but opposition in essence, stand, what they are and where they are heading.

This did not take long happen. From 1941 to the present day, the paths of the OUN and A. Melnyk's group not only diverged, but were completely opposed in the most important, turning points of this historical period, and even in fundamental issues of Ukrainian politics. Let us recall only some of the most important ones.

Since June 1941, the OUN has taken the initiative and the main responsibility to demonstrate and implement the will of the Ukrainian nation to rebuild a sovereign Ukrainian state, to be an independent master of its land, and only on this basis to establish its attitude, its relations with other nations - friendly or hostile, - depending on their attitude to state independence and sovereignty of the people. Proclamation of Art. 6. 1941, the restoration of the Ukrainian State by the People's Assembly in Lviv, the establishment of the Provisional State Government, the holding of a popular plebiscite in the summer of that year on all Ukrainian lands liberated from Bolshevik occupation, the creation of a Ukrainian state and self-governing administration and the restoration of independent Ukrainian life in all areas - all these were acts completed by the sovereign will and forces of the Ukrainian people, without regard to the position of the Hitler regime, against its will, wishes and plans. The OUN was the initiator and organiser of those political acts, and it took responsibility for them in the knowledge that its role in the modern liberation struggle of Ukraine obliged it to do so, in recognition of this role and in the trust of the Ukrainian people and in the belief that such a categorical expression of the will of the Ukrainian nation at that time was correct and final in the face of its own history, the whole world and Germany, whose troops occupied Ukrainian lands.

At such a historic moment, the united Andriy Melnyk Organisation not only dissociated itself, but also expressed a clear negative attitude towards those state and political acts. The answer to this question was given in July 1941 by a Berlin Ukrainian newspaper, which was the spokesman for their opposition. They said that how can one proclaim state independence and build state life without the consent of the German state while

It is at war with the Bolsheviks and its troops are occupying Ukrainian lands? No comment is needed here. This was the most clear-cut, in the language of facts, of living politics, answer to the question: what was the conflict between the OUN and Andriy Melnyk's group about, what was the difference between the OUN and the so-called OUN led by Andriy Melnyk. It was about whether the Ukrainian revolutionary, liberation movement should follow the path taken the OUN or the path taken by Andriy Melnyk's organisation.

This question concerned not only the events of the summer of 1941, but the entire subsequent development, which on both sides in general lines was a consistent continuation of the chosen direction, the fundamental ideological and political attitude and the political nature of both opposing organisations.

After the initial surprise and disorientation of Hitler's policy by such unexpected aspirations and the position of Ukraine, Hitler's response quickly came - the elimination of the developing independent national life, the imprisonment of the chairman and members of the State Board, the relentless struggle against the OUN, attempts to destroy it with terror, the establishment of the Reich Commissariat, and the carving up of Ukrainian lands: The OUN responded to this with an underground revolutionary struggle that was increasingly intensified and expanded, reaching such a size that Hitler's administrative, police and military factors lost control over large, continuous spaces in which the underground forces of the OUN, and later the UPA, had been ruling for all their lives.

And in that phase, the opposition between the OUN and the Melnyk Organisation did not diminish, but deepened, when the Melnyk Organisation actively fought the OUN, which stood against Hitler's enslavement, and continued "the policy of memorials to Hitler of waiting for independence after Hitler's victory in the war". This political opposition was compounded by the most painful phenomena, which, during the imprisonment of OUN members, Testapo could use with the help of some members of Melnyk's organisation.

Also in the new period of one anti-Bolshevik front, Andrii Melnyk's organisation did not cease to occupy a position of opposition to the OUN and the entire revolutionary liberation front. True,

This is limited only to the emigration field, where it operates, but in terms of content it refers to the whole line of the nationalist, liberation movement in Ukraine. The position of the Melnykites is most clearly stated in their brochure "The Forest in its True Light", which is completely negative about the UPA and the armed political struggle against the Bolsheviks in this formulation and on this scale in the current political situation. Today, it has become too unpopular to speak out so clearly against the UPA, and A. Melnyk's organisation, like other similar groups, disguised their true attitude by confessing their recognition of the UPA, and in fact tried to create a fog of confusing interpretations around it.

In terms of ideology, programme, and the internal Ukrainian balance power, the Melnyk Organisation increasingly defined itself in the direction of the guidance of its leading members - in the Wiener Socialist, anti-nationalist camp. She even became the main driving and organising factor in this camp.

Thus, the Andrii Melnyk Organisation, during a decade pregnant with important and difficult events, actively played the role of an opposing runner to the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists and the revolutionary liberation movement organised by it. At the same time, she has used and continues to use the same name, OUN. This political paradox can no longer confuse anyone is familiar with Ukrainian political life over the past decade. No name, no external screen can hide the reality revealed by such clear facts.

This development clearly demonstrates the fact that by 1940 the OUN had two different, opposing ideological and political potentials, directions, two opposing concepts, and that it brought together people of opposing views. The state of their mechanical connection in one organisation could exist under unequal conditions of life and activity of the two parts of the Organisation. In the native lands, in the direct revolutionary struggle, among its demands and conditions, the process of crystallisation, unanimity and natural selection was being completed, and in emigration conditions, the Organisation could be maintained by heterogeneous elements mechanically linked to it, and those with their own goals and interests against the liberation revolutionary movement, and in

Therefore, they had the opportunity to evade the need to surrender their whole life, their whole being, to fit into its framework.

But this state of affairs could only last as long as such conditions existed. It could not withstand the internal exaltation of the moment when elements and tendencies opposed to the existing revolutionary asset tried to direct the Organisation in a different, alien direction. Then there had to come an expulsion, a rupture of one, not of the whole, a rupture along the line of the already existing gap. Similarly, such a state of mechanical connection could not withstand the high external pressure when the entire Organisation, both its parts, the regional and foreign leadership, had to fight the same struggle. Then there had to be a split between the revolutionary activists who were ready and determined to fight that struggle, and between those elements who wanted to avoid it, to take a different path and drag the Organisation down with them. Both of these moments came together at the turning point of the Second World War.

Some may think that the entire policy and activities of Andriy Melnyk's Organisation went in opposite directions to those of the OUN, mainly under the influence of the force of repulsion after the internal conflict and split; that there were and are elements, tendencies and people in it who are determined to follow the path of revolutionary and liberation struggle, the nationalist path, as the OUN was. But they are repulsed by the fact of the split, and therefore those elements and tendencies that have the opposite attitude have prevailed in their organisation.

This might be the case in a different setting. For example, in matters of the relationship between the two organisations, so to speak, face to face, or in matters of internal politics. There, the force of repulsion, of rivalry over the dominant, own ideological and political orientation, may prevail. But not in the fundamental questions of the ways of the liberation struggle and independent policy, such as: should we support the initiative to restore an independent state against the will of a foreign power, or oppose it when this foreign power eliminates it? Should we wage the revolutionary struggle during the war on two fronts, against the Bolsheviks and against Hitler's enslavement, when Hitlerism has already shown its attitude to Ukraine to be no different from that of the Bolsheviks, or should we wait for the outcome of the war, holding the anti-Bolshevik front, and manoeuvre against the Germans, combining memorial policy, cooperation in some areas, and passive non-participation in others?

others? Or in the question of whether to support or condemn and fight the UPA's revolutionary armed struggle in the situation after the end of the Second World War? All of these are fundamental issues, and they are decided by the rationale of the liberation struggle. This is a question of attitude to the enemy, not of the relationship between the two organisations.

It is possible that there are still elements in A. Melnyk's Organisation, there are still elements whose place is in the revolutionary liberation front, and they are kept there by other connections, or who are trying to direct their entire Organisation on this path. If so, they are in the minority there, or without proper influence and voice, and opposing tendencies and people decide and control. That is why the three negotiations between the two Organisations since 1946 could not lead to a successful outcome, with the aim of reaching an understanding and continuing on a common path. Such an understanding and agreement would have been possible on the basis that A. Melnyk's Organisation actually took the path of the OUN, and not just had that name, and joined the revolutionary liberation front, which it had departed from and opposed. But in the Melnyk Organisation, those tendencies always prevail, which are interpreted as an act of recognition that the Melnyk Organisation is nationalist, liberation and revolutionary, that its path is correct, and try to drag the OUN to their path. In further developments, we should expect political crystallisation in the Melnyk Organisation through the separation of heterogeneous elements, or the completion of its ideological and political assimilation.

The content, reasons and consequences of the expulsion of Andriy Melnyk's group from the OUN have already been sufficiently revealed. What remains unexplored, and even mysterious to the Ukrainian public, is the question of the very conduct of that section. Why did it happen at that time and in that way? Ukrainian citizenship saw and experienced the upheaval of the partition process and painfully perceived the fact that it took place at such a difficult and crucial time. Everywhere there was a question of whether this was the end of the matter, whether it could not have been resolved in another way, at another time, more suitable for internal order, when there were no such far-reaching external events. This is a question of historical order and it must be answered.

The short answer is that the act of 10. 2. 1940 was not only an inevitable outcome of the deep process within the OUN, but it also redefined

in the main principles of the direction and specific plan of the OUN's revolutionary, liberation struggle and independent policy during the war. Two opposing concepts stood against each other. One was adopted by Andriy Melnyk's OUN; it was the basis of the entire policy of his organisation during the war. The second concept, outlined by a leading revolutionary activist who later created the OUN Revolutionary Leadership, gave direction to the struggle and policy of the OUN in general during the Second World War. The question was very clear: either - or, one or the other way.

In the first half of January 1940, in a European country that was not yet at war, the then Leader of the OUN in the Native Lands, Tymchii-Lopatynsky, and the author of these lines, submitted a regiment. Andriy Melnyk, as the head of the OUN, from the OUN in Ukraine and from a leading revolutionary activist, a number of proposals that, in one part, outlined the plan for the liberation struggle and independent activity of the OUN in the new situation, and in the second part, touched on the organisational and personal affairs of the OUN, the settlement of which was essential to gain the confidence of the Organisation in the Leadership.

We need to recall the situation at the time: Germany defeated and occupied Poland, a long winter silence in the second war between Hitler's Polish *and* Western campaigns; a German-Soviet pact of amity for the division of spheres of influence exists and is in force; the USSR's war with Finland, the Western powers declare their support for Finland, and prepare support for it; Hitler does not like this war, tries to put it out, does not allow mercenaries to enter Finland. The Bolsheviks, having occupied Galicia and Volhynia, began to "take them over". In such a situation, representatives of the revolutionary leading asset offer, among other things, principles and projects for the plan of further struggle.

The development of the war so far has not created a particularly favourable external situation for our cause. The Ukrainian independence movement is not interested in a war between Germany and the Western powers, and cannot in any way take sides or allow Ukrainian forces to be drawn into that war. We are primarily concerned with the attitude of foreign forces to our liberation struggle and to our enemy, the USSR. We can only consider as allies those nations that will actually be favourably disposed towards Ukraine's state independence and unity. In fact, we cannot consider an ally of the USSR an ally

or friend of Ukraine. In the international situation of the time, the war between the USSR and Finland was of the utmost importance to us.

The Ukrainian liberation movement must demonstrate as strongly as possible that it stands fully with Finland in its defence of independence against the imperialist aggression of our greatest enemy. We must, to the best of our ability and capacity, come forward actively to help Finland and to stand in solidarity with all those international forces and actions which support Finland armed, politically and materially. The world war is only just breaking out, and we must take into account the fact that it also engulf those states that are not yet defeated. The USSR will try to manoeuvre in this way as long as possible to intensify the war, and not to enter it itself, until at the end, when both warring parties are exhausted, to overthrow or at least undermine both sides as much as possible. The defeated side should be crushed by the victor's foot, and the other, exhausted by war, should be replaced and planted with communism. We can take into account various changes in the balance of power on the military fronts. Based on the development of the war to date and the identification of the goals of both belligerents, this war should be interpreted as not ours.

The OUN's revolutionary and liberation struggle should be guided solely by expediency in terms of our internal conditions, capabilities and needs, the state of our forces, the position of the Bolsheviks and the overall situation within the USSR. There are no grounds for introducing into our plans the calculation of external forces and adapting our struggle to their policies. Similarly, we should try to conduct our work abroad in the same way everywhere, completely independently.

In accordance with these general statements, the representatives of the leading revolutionary activists and the Organisation in the Native Lands set out practical projects. The most important of these were as follows:

After the Bolshevik occupation of the Western Ukrainian Lands spreads, to intensify organisational, political and combat activities in the native lands, in particular in the OSUZ, in order to achieve the same level of revolutionary potential and organised underground in all lands of Ukraine as in the Ukrainian Lands. Special attention should be paid to the militarisation of the movement and preparations for a broad insurgency. In the event of Bolshevik attempts to eliminate the main base of the organised

the nationalist revolutionary movement through mass exile and eviction of the entire nationally conscious element, the OUN will organise a broad insurgency, mobilising all combat-capable and certain elements, and will wage a guerrilla insurgency in defence of the evicted territories. The guerrilla action launched should become the focus of a broader . This should be done as soon as the internal situation in the Homeland demands it, in particular in the face of the threat of liquidation of the movement's main base, without regard to any international situation, regardless of the further development of the war.

The main action in foreign affairs was to become actively involved in the Finnish-Soviet war. In order to take advantage of the fact that Western powers had sided with Finland and were helping it, France, in particular, was preparing to send a military unit to the Finnish front. At the time, in the autumn 1939, France began to forcibly mobilise Ukrainians into the Polish army, claiming that they were Polish citizens.

This must be opposed as strongly as possible. To combine both points into one and make persistent efforts to organise a Ukrainian military unit as an independent national legion of volunteers with the aim of fighting against the Bolsheviks in defence of the freedom of Finland. Include this action in the plan of French military assistance to Finland and thus secure support for its implementation. In this way, the forced inclusion of Ukrainians in the Polish army would be paralleled, and a Ukrainian legion would be established abroad to fight Bolshevik Russia.

Regardless of further developments, this action would have brought the following benefits to the Ukrainian liberation cause after the creation of the legion: transformation of the Finnish front into a front of freedom-loving peoples fighting together for independence against Moscow imperialism; political and propaganda, anti-Bolshevik influence on the Soviet army, including Ukrainians; demonstration to the whole world that Ukrainians are fighting Moscow's invasive imperialism wherever they can, and that Ukraine is on the side defending the independence of peoples against that imperialism.

In order to preserve the independence and comprehensiveness of the nationalist movement's foreign policy and foreign activities, such preparations should be made immediately: Andriy Melnyk, as head of the OUN, with a part of

During the war, the leadership should be based in Switzerland or another neutral country that has a firm commitment to remain neutral in the war between Germany and the Western powers. There, the main foreign centre of the liberation movement should be created to represent it in the international forum, and, as far as possible during the war, to manage all foreign activities and link actions on both sides. At the same time, without wasting any time, we must now create two political and operational foreign centres that will organise our activities and carry out political action, in accordance with the general line of the Organisation, in the complexes of both warring parties. One such centre in Germany should also cover all the countries in its political orbit. And the second centre in the sphere of Western states would be created outside Europe, where there is a large Ukrainian emigration, in Canada or the United States. Both of these centres try to keep the political and organisational connection with main centre intact, but if this is not possible for one of them, it must carry out its work independently.

Simultaneously with these projects, a regiment was set up. A. Melnyk was asked to put things in order within the PUN itself so that the PUN could guarantee the independence of the nationalist line and enjoy the trust of the Organisation. In particular, to remove from the PUN such people against whom there were justified accusations of treason and those who, by breaking the internal organisational foundations and political line of the Organisation, had undermined confidence themselves and the Leadership.

There were also demands to maintain the nationalist line in domestic politics, including the cessation of flirtations with political opponents. On the one hand, with the Polishophile group of the UPR, which at that time also made the Ukrainian cause tied to the Polish cause. On the other hand, with Paliyev's group, which clearly stood for a German orientation and created a stir around Ukrainian nationalism by imitating Hitlerism and abusing the name of Ukrainian nationalism.

The projects and demands submitted by Tymchii-Lopatinsky and myself were interpreted by Andriy Melnyk, as head of the OUN, in such a way that, while testing some of them, he rejected the most extreme ones that constituted the core of the entire plan. Regarding the organisation of activities and the struggle in the Native Lands, Andriy Melnyk rejected the possibility of deploying a broad armed

struggle, partisan and insurgent action in the current international situation, even if the internal situation in the native lands demanded it. In this matter, he put forward the following prospects: the war is just breaking out. We can count with certainty on a war between Germany and the USSR. We need to wait for the right moment and include our struggle in the war against Bolshevism. In the meantime, we must build up, prepare and preserve our forces. Even if we had to lose many of our existing forces and positions due to the massive eviction of the western lands, we cannot start an insurgency in the current situation if we are separated in it, because this would destroy our chances and ability to fight in a later, more suitable situation. We treat Germany as our ally and must align our struggle with the development of international events, because this development is going in a direction that is beneficial to us, despite the temporary, tactical understanding between Germany and the USSR.

Similarly, A. Melnyk rejected proposals for an action in the Finnish-Russian war. He said that this was an episode without greater significance. Finland is far away from us and it is inappropriate for us to spend our forces on its front, which should be saved for later. Such an action would have drawn us into unwanted international compliments, and we would have come into conflict with Germany, which is trying to end the war in Finland through an action linked to that of its Western allies. And they do not appear to be entering into a serious military conflict with the USSR over the Finnish case.

At the same time, Andriy Melnyk rejected the plan to establish independent foreign activities at the main points, and considered it unnecessary to move to another, neutral country and create two other second-degree centres, on both sides of the world, cut by the Western front. He said that the PUN had so far managed to keep in touch everywhere and directly control our activities on three continents from one centre, and that it would be lucky in the further development of the war.

The demands on internal policy were met with explanations that no such flirtations had taken place and were not taking place. And in matters of internal organisational affairs, Col. A. Melnyk refused to make changes.

The Regional Leader Lopatinsky and I went to A. Melnyk to present him, as the head of the PUN, with a revolutionary asset of the Organisation

such projects-demands that a) would firmly establish the general line of the revolutionary liberation struggle and independence policy amid the storm of incoming events, b) would settle the affairs of the PUN itself so that it would be the guarantor of the implementation of such a concept, and c) would establish a balance of power and leadership appropriate to the plan and the situation. In the discussions, it became quite clear that two different understandings of the situation, two opposing concepts of the plan, were opposing each other.

Andriy Melnyk and the OUN put the main emphasis on the liberation struggle being conducted in terms of the development of the international balance power, in terms of the development of war. They relied on the war of other states against the USSR, on Germany, which had to enter such a war. Therefore, Germany was treated as an ally. The inclusion of the liberation of Ukraine in the German-Soviet conflict, which was on its way, and the adjustment of our policy so as not to cause conflict and unfavourable German attitudes were the main assumptions from which all conclusions were drawn. Activity and consistency in everything that followed this line, passivity, restraint and waiting in everything that was vague and questionable under that view. Also, the struggle in the Homeland, its intensification, forms and patterns were interpreted from the angle of its integration into the military conflict.

On the other hand, the OUN revolutionary activists followed the line of their own revolutionary struggle. It normalised it according to its own requirements and needs, rather than adjusting it to the external situation. The general situation and external forces were viewed from our point of view according to their relation to the cause of the Ukrainian liberation struggle. We do not depend our struggle on the policy of any state, but we maintain the furthest possible restraint until they clearly and actually show a positive attitude towards Ukraine's liberation struggle. Conducting in every situation a principled policy and liberation activity, without regard to the international situation and the position of foreign forces.

The OUN could not deviate from its path, follow the line chosen by Melnyk's OUN. Tymchii-Lopatynsky and I stated it clearly to Andriy Melnyk that the OUN would go its own way.

On February 10, a meeting of the leading OUN activists called for the Revolutionary Leadership of the OUN, with S. Bandera as its head, who took over the reins of the entire Organisation. A. Melnyk's OUN and part of the OUN members

went their separate and opposite ways.

The OUN implemented the previously outlined plan in its further activities, as far as it was possible to do so. The Revolutionary Leadership placed great emphasis on the development of activities in the Native Lands. The Regional Leader Tymchii-Lopatinsky and other members of the Regional Leadership immediately after 10. 2. left for the Native Lands. The Regional Leader Lopatinsky with the village of Opryshko-Medved and his friend Zena Levytska were caught by the NKVD and killed in action, torn apart by grenades. But now more groups and several members of the OUN revolutionary leadership have been sent to the Land, and work in the Native Lands is on track.

In foreign countries, a significant part of the organisational cells remained in the hands and on the side of A. Melnyk, in particular on the American continent. The Revolutionary Leadership adopted the line of advancing the cause of the conflict and the break with A. Melnyk's PUN only in areas where it was possible to properly highlight the case and to organise its activities through exiled people. It was impossible to do this through correspondence during the war. Efforts were made move a member of the Revolutionary Leadership to America, to organise a separate OUN action in Western countries. However, these efforts were paralysed by people from Melnyk's group, and thus non-European territories remained under the influence of Melnyk's group during the war. Similarly, all OUN foreign policy posts in Europe, except Germany, remained in the hands of A. Melnyk. The Revolutionary Leadership did not want to paralyse what it could not take over and install. In the end, all the European settlements controlled by A. Melnyk ended up in the German bag. A. Melnyk himself also moved to Germany and partially sent representatives from other countries there.

The Revolutionary Leadership immediately took steps to organise a military unit in Finland. Unable to do anything in France, because the Organisation's headquarters there was on the side of A. Melnyk, members of the OUN were sent to Finland and efforts were made to organise an action there with the help of Finnish foreign relations. But these efforts were interrupted by the end of the Finnish-Moscow war.

The revolutionary OUN directed all its attention and energy towards the preparation and organisation of the struggle in the Native Lands, its development and

opposition of Melnyk's group is already known.

Today we are highlighting the main reasons for the act of 10. 2. 1940, which decided that the revolutionary liberation movement during the Second World War and to this day has followed the path taken by the revolutionary OUN, and not the path taken by A. Melnyk's organisation. This is a matter of historical significance and it had to be covered at some point. Now the time has come for it.

Until now, we have left in the shadows these most important, decisive moments of that process, the case of two opposing conceptions of liberation politics. As I have already said, at the beginning it was impossible to disclose these cases because of their relevance. After the war, when they ceased to be so, we remained silent for the reasons that the clarification could not be used and interpreted in the sense of political denunciation.

We consider any such concession that moves Ukrainian politics to such a plane that it becomes subject to interference by foreign factors to be harmful to the national cause. At a time when a wave of blaming collaborators with Hitler's Germany was sweeping across Western Europe, there was a threat that Ukrainian political trends or figures who were guided by their understanding of the rationale of the Ukrainian cause, their assessment of the situation and the expediency of this or that political line could be brought under this category.

The question of the correctness or harmfulness of such directions is an internal Ukrainian issue that should be considered in such an environment and in such a way that no outside factors interfere. This is a matter of honour and sovereignty of Ukrainian politics. Whoever sins against it undermines its main roots. For these reasons, we have postponed this coverage until the appropriate time, at the expense of the fact that various disturbing views and news will continue to be in the public eye.

Now, in our opinion, is the time for clarification. The political thought of the Western world is already dominated by a sober view that the question of collaboration and Quislingism cannot be raised in relation to Ukraine and other peoples who were enslaved by Moscow before the Soviet-German war. From the point of view of the outside world, there was and could be nothing in Ukrainian political life that could be interpreted in this way. We, the entire Ukrainian political world, have not had anything like this since the

war, which would be left to the discretion of foreigners. And this is a position that all Ukrainians should always stand in solidarity with. Because we had two fronts, two enemies at the same time, and no friends in a foreign country. The outside world that Ukraine had to deal with during the war was only enemies who were fighting for its skin. And we did not have a political direction, an environment that would, in fact, cooperate with Germany in the same way as others did, who pacted with Hitler and bought peace from him at the expense of other nations. When some desperate Ukrainian factors believed that the most important thing to do was to escape first of all from the enemy that was older, historical, "eternal", and that it was impossible to fight on two fronts in such a situation, or who believed that that German politics, during the war with the USSR, would have at least a little political sense against peoples fighting against the same enemy, which nation has any moral right to judge this, to consider it collaboration? Where in the world is there a nation or a state that would have had such a situation, or even a much easier one, and not have made a pact with a great evil, a threat to the whole world, whether with Hitlerism or with his older brother and master, Bolshevism? We must reject with indignation every such attempt by outside factors to judge a Ukrainian political movement as a collaborationist one.

But now that wave of dizziness in the Western world has passed, and there can no longer be a psychosis in Ukrainian political life abroad that it caused, that something needs to be hidden, to be covered up. We have never had this and never will. Now, finally, we can calmly consider all the phenomena of our political life in the recent past, among ourselves and for ourselves. Foreign factors do not care about this, we have not sought and should not seek foreign courts. But we also have nothing to hide or keep silent. We believe that it is ultimately important and useful for the proper development of Ukrainian life to highlight the issues that have been raised here. A nation can only draw proper conclusions for the future from its past experience when this past is illuminated in the most important, historical moments, and not covered by the fog of silence and untruth. Secondly, all this is a very recent past, so the same motors, forces, directions and concepts that were in place then are still alive and well in the present. And in the near future, those that remain will continue to operate. So explaining yesterday serves to explain today and

sheds some light on the germs of tomorrow's events in Ukrainian political life.

## **War in Korea and national liberation policy**

*This article was written in connection with the ABI Conference held in Edinburgh on 12-14 June 1950, under the auspices of the Scottish European Freedom League. Using the example of the Korean War (1951-1953) as a branded manifestation of Moscow imperialism, the author once again clarifies and refines the foundations of the Ukrainian national liberation policy, its strategy and tactics of struggle, as well as the importance of a common anti-Bolshevik front of the peoples enslaved by Moscow.*

*The article "The War in Korea and National Liberation Policy" did not bear the author's signature (Stepan Bandera's authorship was confirmed by the editor of "Surma", Stepan Lenkavsky), and was published in the magazine "Surma", Munich, part 21, July 1950.*

The current war in Korea is just one of the incidents that has arisen as a result of the rivalry between world powers to consolidate the positions gained in the aftermath of the Second World War. The false, unprincipled and fundamentally imperialist policy of the majority of Western powers against the Asian peoples objectively paves the way for the Russian imperialist offensive through its deceptive external support for the national struggles of these peoples, while simultaneously penetrating communism and the Communist Party internally, which actually destroy the national content of these peoples' struggles from within.

We deeply sympathise with the tragedy of the Korean people, who have become the object of an inspired, organised, externally fuelled internal civil war in which brother kills brother. The blame for this lies with Russian imperialism, which is the first and actual cause of the war raging against the Korean people. However, those states that, after the end of the Second World , divided the land and people of Korea (which was neither the cause nor a participant in that war, but an enslaved nation) into two parts, north and south, and thus laid the foundations for the war against the Korean people, actually indulged the plans of Russian imperialism against Korea.

The Korean War, as one of the current relevant links in a single

The current anniversary of the all-encompassing offensive of Russian imperialism is an opportunity to once again check, clarify and refine, on the basis of the experience of recent years, the foundations of the Ukrainian national liberation policy, its strategy and tactics of struggle, to make it an effective tool for our daily progress and to keep it from being led astray, which will eliminate the danger of it being drawn into a satellite role under foreign policies, and the revolutionary struggle of the nation from being to prevent it from going astray, and thus to eliminate the danger of Ukrainian politics being drawn into a satellite role under foreign politicians, and the nation's revolutionary struggle for its state becoming manure for someone else's field.

## I

The only way to liberate Ukraine and restore the Ukrainian Independent State is the national liberation war of the Ukrainian people against the Russian Empire, which is now called the USSR; the revolutionary liberation struggle on its own, under all conditions, without regard to the international situation. The Ukrainian nationalist movement has consistently led the people's liberation struggle along this path.

The following factors contribute to the successful unfolding of the revolutionary liberation struggle:

- a) the growth of revolutionary potential, dynamics and readiness of the nation's liberation forces to fully develop the struggle into an uprising and a revolutionary national liberation war;
- b) spreading the revolutionary anti-Bolshevik and anti-Russian struggle among other peoples, strengthening the liberation front of the peoples enslaved by Moscow imperialism;
- c) the internal situation in the USSR, in particular the consequences of the anti-Bolshevik actions of revolutionary forces, the reaction of the masses to social coercion, breakdowns and crises in the Bolshevik system.

Contributing factors include: the international situation, relations between the USSR and external forces, the extent to which they bind and keep Bolshevik forces in suspense, and the favourable attitude of external forces to the liberation struggle of the former Soviet peoples.

The existence, strength, breadth and depth and revolutionary tension of the three main components that make up the process of national liberation struggle determine its final outcome. The most difficult

The foreign policy situation of the USSR and even its complete military defeat in a foreign war, and even with the most favourable attitude of external forces to the idea of national liberation of Ukraine, will not bring freedom to Ukraine without a sovereignly organised and independently acting force of its own.

## //

The current international situation should be considered a turning point in the blackest period of modern history - the highest rise and development of Moscow imperialism and the greatest effectiveness of its instrument, Communist Bolshevism. Germany's war against the USSR in 1941 removed the Soviet Union from the position of "world arbiter and liberator of the whole world", which it had managed to occupy on the seals of the World War, and it was not of its own free will that it found itself in the ranks of the "allies" - Germany's opponents; instead of being the only "world liberator", the USSR became one of the "Big Three".

And the Western world powers, out of their real and concrete interest at the time in the face of the immediate threat from Germany, accepted and cooperated with this "ally", and during the war and after its end, sought long-term coexistence and cooperation with the USSR on the grounds that it would slow down its "maximum programme" and fit into a certain scheme of the world political system built on the basis of "spheres of influence", the coexistence of geopolitical complexes, etc. The price of such a peace between the USSR and the Western powers had to be those nations that had fallen victim to Russian imperialism by that time.

Thanks to this policy of the Western powers, after the end of the Second World War, the Bolsheviks had no external enemy and directed all their energy primarily towards overcoming the liberation movements of the peoples they enslaved, which had widespread during the war; towards the enslavement of the newly conquered countries and preparations for further conquests. At the same time, Russian imperialism began to launch its offensive in different directions, against different peoples, using methods of internal decomposition, substitution and direct aggression. In particular, Moscow's expansion in East Asia has achieved enormous success.

This led to the final collapse of the "Big Three" policy system and

revealed its ephemerality. The state of illusory equilibrium was shaken, and in different parts of the globe, it came to direct military confrontations. This marked the beginning of a new stage in relations between the USSR and its "allies". What is new about this stage is that one of the great powers, the United Arab Emirates, has moved to military countermeasures directly on its own. However, this change in the nature of the relationship concerned the methods of the policy against Bolshevism, not the fundamental goals of this policy.

The goals of the policy of the Western powers against the USSR, which is now being pursued by new methods - the use of weapons - remain the same: to attract and maintain the pre-existing state of separation of influences between the Western bloc of states and the USSR and, as a result, to stabilise relations and coexistence with the Soviet Union. This policy is based on the fundamental consent to the existence of Moscow's imperialist Bolshevism, with its entire essence and practice against the peoples it oppressed, and a passive disinterest in the fate and struggles of those peoples.

The slogans of defence of peoples against Bolshevik enslavement and extermination, the slogans of defence of democratic freedoms and forms of life under which the Western powers oppose Bolshevism, in the policy of these Western powers continue to apply only to those countries on which they have a special interest in preventing them from falling under Bolshevik domination. In the case of Korea, the Western powers support the "idea of freedom" only for the southern part of the Korean people, while the northern part is still ready to be left to Bolshevism, that is, to cut the Korean people into two parts, despite the fact that international treaties and acts of the UN guarantee the state independence of a single and united country. So, in reality, it is about maintaining the delimitation of spheres of "influence" through living national organisms.

### ///

The current political situation in the world is shaped not only by the opposition of the two great power blocs - the USSR with its satellites and the Western powers. The liberation struggles of enslaved peoples around the world for their independence and state sovereignty play an equally important and ultimately decisive role, constituting a third force complex and, alongside both opposing blocs, forming the international power structure.

At the same time, numerous nations are undergoing processes of profound shifts in the spheres of spirituality, internal political and socio-economic relations, which in their totality are being formed into the national idea and nationalism as a universal political system, as a fundamental factor in the global organisation of the whole of humanity.

The Western powers underestimate or deny the importance and driving force of the national idea and the liberation movements of enslaved peoples. They do not provide a solution to the independent struggles of the peoples in their colonies and do not want to take an active stance in favour of the liberation movements of the peoples in sub-Bolshevik Europe and Asia, as required by the common cause of the struggle against Russian imperialism and its international instrument, Bolshevism.

Instead, Bolshevism is inherently hostile to the national idea. It mercilessly destroys the nationally independent struggles and forces of the peoples enslaved by Russia (although it tries to cover this up with propaganda of allegedly independent satellite states and union national republics within the USSR), and acts as a spokesman for the national idea outside its borders, supports and promotes the independent struggle of colonial and semi-dependent states and peoples to strengthen their struggle against Western powers and tries to direct this struggle on a communist track in order to drive Western powers out of those countries and, through the system of communist internal organisation of the life of those peoples, to conquer them under its domination.

The revolutionary liberation struggle of Ukraine and the entire anti-Bolshevik bloc of peoples is being waged in isolation, by our own peoples, without any support from Western powers. This struggle has been, is and will be the most confident, unchanging and, in every situation, active factor in the world front against Bolshevism and aggressive Russian imperialism in all its forms. The anti-Bolshevik liberation front of the enslaved peoples in the world competition between the two rival blocs creates a third force that differs from them in its goals, quality and methods of action.

In the current policy of the Western powers, and in particular the ZSA, there are no serious manifestations of a positive attitude towards our national liberation, anti-Moscow (anti-Bolshevik) struggle and its goals - the destruction of Bolshevism and all

of invasive Russian imperialism, the division of the USSR and the building of independent national states of the still enslaved peoples. While this state of affairs could have been justified by the desire for peaceful coexistence and "allied" cooperation with the USSR "at any cost", the Cold War turns into a hot war, the continuation of this policy would clearly prove that the factors driving the policy of the Western powers, mainly the United States, Britain and France, have fundamentally different goals against the USSR and our peoples than those to which our struggle aspires - to the collapse and division of the Russian Empire, the USSR, and to the building of national states.

#### **IV**

There is no hope that the wishes of the Western powers will be fulfilled, namely that the armed conflict in Korea and the whole tension of the situation will quickly end with the return to the previous state of delimitation of spheres of influence, and that their resolute attitude will be followed by stabilisation of relations - a broader and more lasting understanding with the USSR. The Bolsheviks do not want any real stabilisation or peace, and they have no intention of stopping the further march of their imperialism... They are doing their best to ensure that the war between the Western powers and the independence and communist movements of the peoples of East and South Asia, the Malayas, Korea and Communist China will break out and spread. Having ignited a war between the Western powers and the Asian peoples, Moscow will support, strengthen and spread it by all means in order to make the Western powers spend a lot of energy and lose all confidence in the broad masses of the Asian peoples. Against this background, the military and political prestige of the USSR should increase disproportionately, as a power that has not yet said its word and that will resolve the whole competition in such a way that at the most convenient moment it will enter into an open war, or, if the development is not beneficial for it, will seek another, temporary, compromise solution in the form of "mediation" in the "peace between China and the United States", etc.

The bet of Western policy that the conflict in Korea, with their resolute stance and military reaction, will put a firm limit to the further advance of Russian imperialism and lead to peaceful stabilisation and cooperation between the West and the USSR is wrong. It is based on the desire to reconcile with Bolshevism at the expense of all those

The nations that have already fallen victim to it. For all the peoples struggling for their liberation from Russian enslavement, this direction of Western policy is harmful. But it is equally harmful to the cause of defending the rest of the world, including the Western powers themselves, against Russian imperialism.

Considering the current policy of the Western powers against Russia in the Korean conflict in general, we must positively assess the method of action itself - a decisive military response, although the very fundamental goal of this policy is wrong. We can assume, however, that after the change in the method in one part of the conflict, under the influence of the factor of national liberation wars of enslaved peoples and the possible spread of the conflict to other areas, there will be a change in the goals of Western policy.

## V

The revolutionary liberation struggle of Ukraine and other nations against the Bolshevik bloc, with its goals, its continuous action and its potential for the radical destruction of Bolshevism and Russian imperialism, is the most stable and radical factor in the anti-Bolshevik front.

The anti-Bolshevik movements, and even the military actions of various states, even if they were very violent, if their action is not aimed at destroying Russian imperialism, but only at forcing it to make some concessions, will not be as important for the order and peace of the world as the national liberation revolutions of the enslaved peoples.

As the political and military conflicts between the USSR and other states deepen and spread, and as a new world war is fuelled, the attitude of these states should be brought closer to the fundamental position of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Peoples. As long as the Western powers do not seek the complete destruction of Bolshevism and Russian imperialism, the collapse of the USSR and the revival of the national states of the currently enslaved peoples on its ruins, and are only fighting to stop Bolshevik aggression and expansion (even if they wage open war for this purpose), there is no reason link our liberation struggle to their policies and conflicts.

We can and will use opportunities and situations favourable to our struggle. Likewise, our liberation struggle is objectively a useful factor for foreign policies and actions against the USSR. The liberation struggle of Ukraine and other peoples could be linked to the anti-Bolshevik struggle of foreign states only on the basis of an allied attitude, with binding agreement on goals and with the proper provision of our countries and the needs of our war front in the integrity of the war.

In every international situation, regardless of the attitude of external forces to us and our struggle, we are objectively involved in the defence of the entire world through our struggle against Russian imperialism and Bolshevism. The struggle of Ukraine and all the peoples united in the ABN is constantly fulfilling this mission. Every Ukrainian and every Ukrainian community abroad, fulfilling their duty against the Motherland, thereby serves the cause of defending the will of the peoples and protecting the highest human values - God's Truth on earth against Bolshevism, whether foreigners understand and appreciate this or not.

Every labour and every sacrifice of Ukrainian forces and Ukrainian blood in the struggle against Bolshevism have the greatest value and effect, both for Ukraine and for the whole of humanity, when they are given on or for the Ukrainian liberation front. All Ukrainian political and military efforts abroad must be directed by all means, in all ways and from all parts of the world to strengthen the revolutionary and liberation struggle in the Motherland. All Ukrainian factors abroad and every Ukrainian should clearly defend the positions of the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement with their whole posture and work and act in accordance with them. We must make every effort to ensure that the world, all nations, both the ruling state factors and the masses, know and correctly assess our situation: how and for what we are fighting, which policies and methods of fighting Bolshevism are appropriate and successful, and which are useless. By doing so, we will help to put the policies and attitudes of the various derkhavas against Bolshevism on the right track.

Every undertaking along the lines of unprincipled adaptation and minimalism in matters of attitude towards the USSR, every undertaking that is inconsistent with these principles of national policy, that creates a stir

regarding the positions of the national liberation struggle, and which is designed have a ripple effect along a fundamentally wrong path, has value for the cause of liberating Ukraine and overcoming Bolshevism.

## Enslaved Nations Front

*This article, like the previous one, was also written in relation to the Edinburgh Conference of the . In a letter from St. Bandera (signed "Yarych") to J., dated 17. 7. 1950, there is the following explanation: "... I am quoting an article from "Surma," which was written in the main part by S.A. (Stepan Andriyovych - DM), edited, shortened, and with a little of his own, by Kamian. But in "Surma" it was published with the introductory part significantly cut off, because there was no space (it was given as the issue was already compiled and partially printed). It can also be published in the "Call of the Way" in its entirety, without a signature, as an official, editorial article..."*

*The article "The Front of Enslaved Nations" was published in "Surma", Munich; part 21 July 1950, without the author's signature. The topic discussed in this article was once again touched upon in the article "The Tasks of the OUN in the Modern Age", in the first part of the article, "The Tasks of the OUN in Ukraine".*

One of the greatest achievements of the revolutionary policy of Ukrainian nationalism in the last decade is the current implementation of the ideas of a common national liberation front of all peoples enslaved by the Russian Empire.

The idea of the sovereignty of a nation in its own state, on which Ukrainian nationalism is based, is a universal global, human idea. But, like every idea, it has real meaning when it is consciously and deliberately put into practice.

The universality of the idea of nationalism for all nations around the world is not new in the history of modern Ukrainian nationalism and Ukrainian political thought. The genius Shevchenko had already formulated it in his writings in relation to the whole world and every nation, but this universality of the idea of nationalism was not embodied in the actual national liberation policy and struggle. Moreover, in 1917, in the practical policy of the national leadership of the time, the universality of the idea of nationalism was put at the service of anti-nationalism. The organic unity of the idea and ranks of all the nations enslaved by Moscow was used to convene a congress of representatives of the enslaved peoples in Kyiv on the initiative of the Central Rada to discuss and coordinate the political actions of the enslaved peoples

Moscow was using the peoples to save the integrity of "democratic" Russia. Such a political distortion of the very idea of nationalism, the idea of state and political independence of enslaved nations, of course, could not only contribute to the creation of a united front of enslaved peoples to fight for their right to exist, but also killed the very idea of Ukrainian nationalism.

In the period between the two world wars, Ukrainian political thought and Ukrainian nationalism did not pay due attention to the issues of the current movement in a certain political system of the idea of cooperation between nationalisms of enslaved nations. Moreover, in the period between the two world wars, political forces hostile to nationalism intensified the spread of distorted and false substitutes for international cooperation in the form of all kinds of small antennas of small imperialists (Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia) - satellites of large imperialist powers. For mutual imperialist struggle, imperialists and enemies of nationalism put forward various ideas of federation, intermariums, etc. for the enslaved nations.

It seems that we will not be mistaken when we say that the policy of the Revolutionary Front of Enslaved Nations, as a real factor and a conscious system of action, was born and rooted on the battlefields of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army against Moscow. Sometimes, enemy propaganda denounces the UPA as an "international rabble" (sobranina) fighting in its ranks. This propaganda knows perfectly well what this "zbiranyna" is. These are nationalist soldiers from almost all the peoples enslaved by Moscow, who, as individuals or separate national units with their own command and political leadership, are fighting for their national goals in the ranks of the UPA.

These goals are well understood by one of the UPA soldiers (pseudonym Kolya), when he tells his Ukrainian comrades-in-arms about his Kazakhstan, his homeland, in barely fluent Ukrainian, and says: "Kolya is a soldier of the Kazakh UPA!"

And it was these soldiers and officers of the nations enslaved by Moscow, who, being in the ranks of the UPA and fighting for free Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Belarus - for their nation - in 1943, in the break between battles, in the midst of their fire, created the ABN - the organisational and political completion of the idea of a common revolutionary and liberation struggle of all

of the nations enslaved by Moscow.

These great national politicians, wearing the uniforms of ordinary soldiers, sergeants, lieutenants, and majors of the UPA, completed a great deed: the ideological universality of nationalism was transformed into an effective system of international revolutionary and liberation cooperation of enslaved nations in their struggle for their goals. The spiritual and ideological solidarity of the nationalisms of different nations found its effective expression in a common, coordinated system of struggle.

From an ethical and moral point of view, any nationalism of a nation free from foreign enslavement is morally responsible for any violence and enslavement of another nation, wherever it occurs on the globe. The greater and more concrete is the political and moral responsibility of Ukrainian nationalism, as the greatest force opposed to Moscow's imperialism, for the fate of other nations enslaved by Moscow and in the same situation as Ukraine.

This political, moral, spiritual unity of the enslaved nations in their struggle for their goals, as an inseparable whole, coincides with the selfish, healthy interest of each enslaved nation. The highest moral foundations are only the expression of the highest, reasonable and expedient, selfishness. Isn't wisdom: "Do not wish for another what you do not wish for yourself!" is not at the same time an expression of the highest moral norm for the whole of humanity, every nation, every person, and at the same time a norm of healthy individual and national egoism?

The full and highest victory of Ukrainian nationalism will be when the Russian Empire ceases to exist and all the peoples enslaved by it gain national and state freedom. Without that, Ukraine cannot have a complete victory, or this victory will be partial and questionable.

If, for example, Ukraine were to break away from the Russian empire as a state, and Kazakhstan or the nations of the Caucasus remained part of that empire, it would be tantamount to saying that the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation and state is in great danger from Moscow's imperialism. Therefore, a situation in which Ukraine became free and some other nation enslaved by Moscow remained part of the empire's enslaved would be considered a failure of Ukraine to achieve its goals

Ukrainian nationalism, but only a stage before that, a state of temporary respite in the struggle, a pause.

The realisation of this by the political thought of Ukrainian nationalism and its acceptance of the political postulate that without the defeat of the Moscow Empire and its division into national states of all peoples enslaved by the empire, without exception, the liberation of Ukraine cannot be achieved is one of the main postulates of Ukrainian national liberation policy.

This principle is simultaneously the cornerstone of the national liberation policy of every other nation oppressed by Moscow: without the national-state liberation of Ukraine, the national-state sovereignty of Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Belarus, the nations and their states of the Caucasus and Turkestan (Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Cossack State, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan) and others, while the sovereignty of Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, to a large extent Turkey, Greece and others, not to mention the nations and states along the Asian border of the USSR, is in question.

This is the basis for the organic nature and irreversibility of the political system and ideas of the front of enslaved and threatened nations for their victory over Moscow imperialism.

By the fact of its geopolitical position in the system of the Moscow empire, by its size, Ukraine forms the core of the system of organising the front of the peoples enslaved by Moscow. The actual struggle of Ukraine and its contribution to the national liberation revolutions of all enslaved nations is crucial to the overall victory. This objective role of the Ukrainian national liberation struggle in the front of the enslaved nations cannot be neglected or limited without jeopardising the ultimate goals of Ukrainian nationalism and the national interests of all enslaved nations.

This circumstance imposes on Ukraine and its national liberation policy extremely large and decisive tasks for the success of the struggle of the Front of Enslaved Peoples.

The front of enslaved peoples, with Ukraine at its centre, encompasses vast expanses inhabited by different nations, different races, different religious systems, diverse cultural and historical

of the world. Often, relations between neighbouring nations are complicated and burdened by various disputes and antagonisms that have been built up over the centuries; often these antagonisms between enslaved nations were inspired and intensified by the enslaver of the antagonising nations on the principle of "divide and conquer!" In these circumstances, the adoption by the front of the enslaved nations of unified political ideas, a unified strategy of national liberation struggle, and unified tactics of struggle is the most important basis for victory.

"In my own house, my own truth" (Taras Shevchenko) translated into political language as "sovereign conciliar national state" of each nation on the territory of its nationality, as the basis of Ukrainian and other nationalisms, became the ideological and political basis of the Front of Enslaved Peoples, formed by the ABN in 1943 in Ukraine.

The greatest enemy and danger for the front of enslaved peoples is the involvement of its individual members in imperialism against their neighbours, who are also enslaved. The unity and cohesion of the front of enslaved peoples is weakened by the imperialism of the national liberation policies of individual nations: the imperialism of Polish policy against Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, the imperialism of Czech policy against Slovakia and Ukraine, the imperialism of Romanian policy against Ukraine, etc, traces or manifestations of which can also be found in the relations between the policies of other enslaved peoples, constitute the openings in the front through which the enemy penetrates into the interior, into the back of this front.

It is impossible to look at Poland's policy towards Ukraine, Belarus, and Lithuania without moral disgust, and it is impossible to understand the suicidal nature of this policy for the Polish nation, which has resulted in Polish policy towards Ukraine being a miserable satellite of Moscow's policy three hundred years later, and which has caused irreparable damage to Poland itself and to the historical fate of the entire nation for centuries to come.

For centuries, Poland has been destroying itself in Ukraine, wasting its best human resources on the conquest of Ukraine, neglecting its own national interests in its own lands, in order to reach a state in which there is no material or cultural legacy of that domination, of that expansion in Ukraine.

trace, not a single physical carrier of Polish expansion and culture, not a single Pole, but instead a bloody scar of historical wrong and a sense of disgust of the Ukrainian people towards Poland. The common enemy is using this revulsion to further enslave and destroy the Polish people on their own lands.

The Czech policy against Slovakia and the Slovaks and Ukrainians in Zakarpattia is pathetic. This policy has now resulted in pro-Moscow, pro-communist Prague exterminating anti-communist, anti-Moscow, Catholic-Christian Slovakia with the hands of Moscow's puppets.

Thus, the policy of an enslaved people, poisoned by imperialism against another enslaved people, leads its own people to ruin, suffering and even greater enslavement. The classic examples are the policies of Warsaw's Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and some others, which, as a result of alleged imperialism, a caricature of imperialist policies, became miserable satellites of foreign policies, primarily Moscow's, and then fell victim to them.

The policy of alleged imperialism of individual nations significantly weakens the united front of the enslaved peoples, and pits the policy and national potential of the enslaved peoples of Poland, the Czech Republic and some others against the front of the enslaved peoples, and puts them on the side of the enemies of the enslaved peoples, i.e., in the final analysis, the enemies of their own nation. Poland, which is or will be fighting with Ukraine for Lviv, with Belarus and Lithuania for Vilno, will thereby be fighting against its own sovereignty. When Polish politics regards the current state of Poland as the state after the fourth dismemberment of Poland, the same "Lviv and Wilno" policy is preparing the fifth dismemberment of Poland, without adding the simple fact that after each such dismemberment, even the ethnographic position of the Polish nation is increasingly squirming and narrowing.

Polish politics is trying to poison other nations and states, including Ukraine, with alleged imperialism. For example, it inspires and sells to Ukrainian politicians the "idea" of ceding western Ukraine's territories to Poland by compensating Ukraine by "carving up" "no man's land" in the east. As a result of this notorious policy, the Warsaw Pact emerged, followed by the Riga Treaty, to finally

to become a sealed Marshal Rokossovsky after the last war. All these are links in the same chain. The same Poles, inspired and financed by all sorts of "Eastern, Black Sea, Grey, Green" Ukrainians in Warsaw, have been trying, and have not given up this thankless task, to instil in Ukrainian thought and politics the "idea" of imperial expansion to the East. The ultimate goal of this inspiration is to fundamentally undermine Ukraine's political position in the front of enslaved peoples, to tear out the core of this front and thus clear the way for Polish alleged imperialism, which flatters itself with the hope of "snatching something" when "someone" overthrows Moscow.

Bearing in mind that in the east of Ukraine, on its eastern borders, the spaces between Ukraine, the lower reaches of the Volga River and the Volga region, the Caspian Sea, the Caucasus range and the Black Sea are largely imbued with the Ukrainian national element, and the space of the Kuban forms a continuous Ukrainian national massif, meaning that Ukraine has justified natural interests in that space, Ukrainian policy in that space is nationalist and consistent: since the Cossack population of these lands has been actually achieving national and state separation from Moscow in 1917 on the basis of the creation of an independent Cossack state, Ukraine unconditionally recognises and supports this trend in the political development of the Cossack space and will continue to do so.

Ukraine will unconditionally recognise the national and state sovereignty of the Cossack federal state as long as it is not encroached upon by Moscow. In this latter case, Ukraine will join forces with those forces of national and state liberation of the Cossack space that will oppose Moscow jointly fight for the state independence of the Cossack lands.

Ukraine is ready to renounce the national space and population that is gravitating towards it - the Kuban - in the name and for the good of the entire vast Cossack space, which would create its own Cossack federal state, in which the Ukrainian Cossack Kuban would contribute to the development of its Ukrainian culture, Ukrainian spirit, and Ukrainian system of internal organisation. In a sovereign Cossack state, Ukraine would gain a faithful, historically traditional, good neighbour.

This is how we address the issue of the space in which Ukraine has historically lived,

geopolitically and directly ethnographically closely interested, and by solving it consistently nationalist, Ukraine thus inspires and directs the practical solution and application of the principle of "truth in one's own home" in relations between all peoples of the front of enslaved nations.

Ukraine has not had, does not have and will not have any imperialist or imperialist goals against its neighbours or other nations. And this determines the fragility of its pivotal positions in the front of enslaved nations.

The second principle, which stems from the principle of national and state sovereignty of every nation, even the smallest in number, on its ethnographic territory, is the principle of sovereign solution of all problems of internal organisation and life of an enslaved nation that is a member of the Front of Enslaved Nations. Therefore, the Front of Enslaved Nations, united in the ABN, does not bind its members and does not impose any problems of internal national relations - religious, political, social and other. Each nation solves these problems as it sees fit.

Ukraine, in the front of the enslaved nations, is fighting all kinds of ideas of internationalism, historical vocation, world justice, social liberation, etc. as false ideas, which are used to hide and disguise the aggressive imperialist goals. Every nation has and should establish "its own right" in its own house. From this point of view, Ukrainian nationalism considers attempts of foreign political pressure on nation-states aimed at changing the system of internal relations within nation-states to be unacceptable interstate discrimination. Since Spain is a nation-state and does not enslave another nation politically, international discrimination against it under the guise of its undemocratic system is nothing more than immoral sabotage.

The strategic principle of the Front of the Enslaved Nations is the principle of its own forces and the revolutionary national liberation struggle on their basis. This principle can be summarised as follows: "enslaved nations can only liberate themselves!"

On this basis, the Enslaved Nations Front rejects in principle the system of liberation policy of the so-called "bloodless" liberation

of enslaved nations, that is, a policy that does not end in a direct revolutionary war of liberation between the enslaved nation and its occupier. Many nations "liberated" after the First World War, especially the Czechs, Magyars, and even the Poles, lost their state sovereignty so quickly during and after the Second World War, primarily because they did not pay the proper price for their "liberation" - the blood of the nation - or this "liberation" was simply taken from the hands of others, "bloodlessly". Is it not because the Finns retained their state sovereignty that after the First World War they paid for it very dearly with the blood of this small but heroic nation?

Before the outbreak of the Second World War, in 1940, in the Soviet-Finnish war, they paid even more blood to maintain this loyalty, to prevent the "government of the Finnish People's Republic" formed and proclaimed in Moscow from coming to Helsinki. Kuusinen. During the Second World War, in the struggle for this sovereignty, the Finns again gave a lot of their blood. In proportion to the size of their people, we believe that the Finns, in comparison with all other nations enslaved by Moscow - Ukrainians, Poles, Belarusians, not to mention Czechs - paid the highest price in blood for their freedom and sovereignty. And that is why they are sovereign today, even though they have been robbed and robbed.

Over the last thirty years, Moscow has formed several "people's" governments for Kyiv, Sofia, Warsaw, Bukarest, Budapest, Tiflis and several other capitals, but the "government" created under Kuusinen, formally cursed in Moscow and with which Moscow established diplomatic and state-legal relations and set conditions, has not taken root in Helsinki since 1940 and to this day. There is no sign that he will ever settle there.

In our age of political primitivism, general savagery and dumbing down of public morality, this fact of the creation of Kuusinen's "government" for Helsinki in 1940 went unnoticed. This puppet disappeared and has not reappeared to this day. Meanwhile, the "failure of the number" with Kuusinen's "government" shows that Moscow, the almost two hundred million-strong USSR, suffered an unexpected and unheard-of defeat from the three million-strong Finnish nation.

This model of sovereign national liberation policy at any cost

and the victims of the nation is a concrete example of the implementation of the postulate of the strategy of the front of enslaved nations: "the strategy of own forces and revolutionary war against the occupier".

In the national liberation policy of the Ukrainian nationally active community, in the practice of national life in a foreign land, in the practice of too many Ukrainian organisations, parties, cultural institutions, and in the Ukrainian press, the most important aspect of our national liberation struggle - the front of the enslaved nations - is almost completely neglected. Our institutions, our political organisations do not put into practice the unity of the front of the enslaved nations on a daily basis, our press does not inform its readers about the struggle of this front, our press is filled with descriptions and information about Indochina, about Venezuela, about Malaya, about Indonesia, about the life and struggle of these peoples, but our press does not give the Ukrainian reader anything about the struggle of Georgia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, the Cossacks, the struggle of Shamil, the uprising of the Basmachi in Turkestan in 1930, etc. п., does not inform about the history of these peoples, their struggles, their victories, their sacrifices. Ukraine and the Ukrainian are already united with the Kazakh and the Azerbaijani by the blood shed in the ranks of the UPA, we are already blood brothers with these peoples, we are united by the unity of national destiny and common struggle.

On the frontline of the enslaved nations, we are to a large extent in the fairway of Moscow, Poland and, in general, "international" rather than national politics. Just like Moscow, we are writing and politicking about Vietnam, about the African Murins and Abyssinians, to whom Moscow is focusing our attention, and forgetting about Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Tajikistan, Belarus and other nations whose fate and misfortunes, successes and failures are dependent on Ukraine's fate and misfortunes.

Ukraine is the pivot of the front of the peoples enslaved by Moscow in their struggle for national and state liberation. The success and victory of this front primarily depends on Ukraine's active pivotal role in it.

Interethnic politics of Ukrainian political environments, their press, their social and public activities, even culture and art,

the theatre is confused in the dumps of international socialism (the URDP and its organ Vpered), Russian united federalism (contacts and relations of the left-wing Ukrainian currents with the Kerenskyiad and Muscovites), discussing "mandzimozhenia", "Ukrainian Oceanic" (publications of "Black Sea and Oceanic Institutes" with Warsaw roots), compete for the happiness of Ukraine and the world with "collectivism", which V. Vynnychenko preaches on the pages of the "Ukrainian News" of the second URDP. Vynnychenko and the like, i.e., Ukrainian political thought in the international politics of relations is being dragged down and rearranged into foreign, anti-Ukrainian, anti-national, objectively pro-Moscow and pro-Moscow garbage cans.

The Front of Enslaved Nations is a mutual understanding of the history, culture, interethnic relations, economics, social systems, religion of the nations enslaved by Moscow, from the national sources of these nations, and not through Moscow's thick sieve or in its crooked mirror; the Front of Enslaved Nations is the crystallisation and mutual coordination of the policies, strategies and tactics of the national liberation struggle of these nations among themselves, not snobbish feuding over black coffee about the "policy of the greats" and which leg Truman or Churchill got out of bed on today, or what colour Stalin's face was at the last parade. The Front of Enslaved Nations is the creation of revolutionary insurgent armies from all enslaved nations, these are national Uzbek, Azerbaijani, Georgian hundreds, kurens, regiments, divisions in the UPA and the same national Ukrainian, Belarusian, maybe Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian hundreds, kurens, regiments, divisions in the Kazakh, Uzbek or united Turkestan UPA. The Front of Enslaved Peoples is the national liberation revolutions of dozens of enslaved peoples from the Iron Curtain to the Pacific Ocean, in which all enslaved nations in this space - Kazakh or Korean - will take part, thrown by the occupier into Ukraine, is and will be a soldier of the UPA, just as a Ukrainian thrown by the occupier into distant Kazakhstan or Korea or Karelia or another land of the enslaved people will become a soldier of the national UPA there, fighting for Ukraine.

To realise this, to study, substantiate and apply in practice, to realise in concrete action the idea of a front of nations enslaved by Moscow, to make the entire space of the USSR - the prison of enslaved nations - a continuous space of national liberation revolutions, un

directed and guided by a common strategy and tactics - this is the basis of the international policy of Ukrainian nationalism, the national duty of every Ukrainian, every Ukrainian institution, organisation, political grouping, and individual politician.

And when the Ukrainian community in a foreign land perceives and implements the idea of a front of enslaved nations in this way, it will strengthen and consolidate this front, and thus help the successful action of this front in the homeland, which is so widely realised through the combat , the blood of the UPA soldiers with the soldiers of all enslaved peoples in the united ranks.

From the "Iron Curtain" ("Iron Curtain", a term coined by British Prime Minister Churchill to describe the demarcation line between the Moscow-Bolshevik and Western spheres of influence in Central and Eastern Europe. This definition characterises the closeness of the Soviet western borders to both the population of the Bolshevik empire and Western citizens) to the Pacific Ocean.

## **The Third World War and the liberation struggle**

*The events of the Korean War exacerbated the political situation in the world so much that the prospect of a third world war was not far away. In the new situation, new opportunities arose for the Ukrainian cause, so it was necessary to determine in advance the exact positions and tasks of Ukrainian independent policy. This was done by Stepan Bandera in this article. Bandera in this article.*

*It was published, without his signature, in three issues of Surma (issues 22, 23, 24 August, September, and October 1950). Having clarified the Western concept of political warfare against Bolshevism, the author warned the Ukrainian community against self-deception and hopes that the war against Moscow Bolshevism would automatically make Western countries allies of Ukraine, which was fighting against this Bolshevism-imperialism. A national revolution would provide another opportunity for liberation. Similar views on these matters are found in other articles: "Propaganda of the Liberation Revolution Against the Backdrop of War" and "Against the Ideological Disarmament of the Liberation Struggle".*

### **The western concept of political warfare From bolshevism**

The war in Korea has given the international situation such a distinct perspective and pace that the possibility of a third world war is becoming a serious factor in all political planning, even for short term. The military issues of the coming war are still hanging in the dark - when, where, how it will break out, which fronts, at what stage of the war will be the main ones. There are various assumptions; the military staffs probably have plans for various possibilities, but no one can predict the military development of the world's largest competition, because it will be the result of actions and reactions on both sides. Neither side will have the initiative on all fronts and in all forms of warfare.

Instead, the political fronts are already quite clearly drawn, because the war in the political plane is already underway. Later, when the hot war breaks out, there will only be an escalation, intensification of political oppositions, some additions, and the diplomatic platforms and tactical manoeuvres that exist, but the basic guidelines will disappear,

The general lines of policy of both sides in the war, as well as the fronts of their enemies, are already clear, they are already in place. Anyone who thinks that the political polygons have not yet been determined, that the political playing field is now shrouded in early mists that will dissipate with the first explosions of grenades and bombs of the third world war, is mistaken and deceived. But no. Those who look well will already see everything clearly, and for those who find the fogs impenetrable, it's a pity, as they will become even thicker in more than one stretch.

So it is time to define the position of Ukrainian independence policy against the sketched, and in some ways clearly crystallised, political fronts of the protracted war. This cannot be postponed until the war breaks out, in the hope that a major change in the fundamental attitude to the Ukrainian cause will come then. We must take into account the fact that at the beginning of the war our position in international politics will not improve much, and the mechanics of military events will make it very difficult to orientate ourselves and to establish the main political lines of independent action abroad. If there were a significant change in the attitude of the Western powers to our liberation cause, it would be easier to adjust our plans. But we have to take as our basis what now seems most plausible, which already determines the main lines and drivers of Western policy, which creates a more difficult situation for us.

The current political and military actions of the world powers, regardless of diplomatic tricks and press coverage, are a real reflection of hidden intentions and intentions for the future, which reveal not only the ultimate goal but also the ways to achieve it.

It is important that the Ukrainian emigrant community have a sober, realistic assessment of what they will face, and not lull themselves into fantasy hopes and then become confused and disappointed by the reality and the course of events. We need to soberly face the truth, take it into account and make up our minds about what we should do, how we should act, what we should do to bring success to the liberation cause, and to influence the attitude of the world's existing forces to change their attitude towards it through our initiative, our attitude and action. Accurate foresight and a sober assessment of the reality we will have to deal with, determining in advance the correct direction of our policy are prerequisites for

The Ukrainian forces scattered around the world should be able to operate along the same basic line.

The Ukrainian liberation struggle, in particular during the USSR's war with other states, had to take into account the development of the world situation, which it also co-shaped. Linking the Ukrainian cause to international development is correct if it is based on an accurate analysis and assessment of it, in particular, an assessment of the political attitude of the USSR's opponents. Otherwise, it can be entirely false and disastrous. The premise: "the enemy of my enemy is my ally" is used by the masses in a very wide range of ways, depending on how much the positive goals of both sides agree or disagree in the area where their interests converge.

### ***False hopes and politics self-deception***

Many people see a very simple solution to linking the Ukrainian liberation struggle with the war of the Western powers against the USSR. Their concept of liberation is as follows: when the Western powers are forced to wage war against the USSR, they will fight until the Bolshevik empire is completely defeated, will try to involve all hostile Bolshevik forces, including the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people, in a single military effort, and will set universal goals of the war that will include the demands for the liberation of Ukraine and its state independence, either clearly formulated or within some general framework.

Our task is to bring all our forces and struggle into the military competition of the Western powers, if possible as a separate, determined factor. Ukrainian forces abroad must create and introduce into military operations a Ukrainian military unit that will be the nexus of the Ukrainian army and will be augmented by Ukrainians from the Soviet army. And the revolutionary struggle on the other side of the front, in Ukraine, should be the strongest possible supporting factor for the external front. The greater the potential and effect of our contribution to the war on the side of the Western powers, the better we will ensure that they recognise us and that our goals are realised.

There will also be quite important currents and forces against the state independence and unity of Ukraine, in particular, the attempts of Russian anti-communist but imperialist forces, the claims of the Poles to

The western lands of Ukraine, and perhaps other neighbours. In order to successfully oppose them, we must make such a large contribution to the war that it outweighs our value and the importance of our voice in the Western powers, and at the same time our military force, created in the course of the war on the side of the anti-Bolshevik coalition, must be relatively large in order to support the will of the Ukrainian people, as necessary, armed and to oppose the attacks of our neighbours.

This is how the concept of including the cause of Ukrainian liberation in the military quadrilateral of the Western powers looks like. Regardless of whether or not it is now being put forward by any Ukrainian factor in such a distinct and coherent manner, it still exists in the political thinking of some people, and it seems to them to be the only possible and realistic one, so all our actions and efforts should follow this line.

Is it real, are there any grounds to accept it as the main stake of Ukraine's liberation struggle in the Third World War? The key lies in the answer to the fundamental question: will the Western powers, in particular the United States, in this situation, put forward the cause of Ukraine's state independence as one of the goals of the war, in a way that would bind them in the future and give them some guarantees? And the next question is whether there are any elements in their policies that compete for something else, that do not give room for the struggle for Ukraine's sovereignty and unity within their complex?

The entire past and present policy of Western states, including the United States, does not provide any grounds or sustainable arguments for a positive response to the questions posed in the sense of this concept. All that is in place in American politics in relation the Ukrainian cause, and it must be said that it does not exist, because it actually completely ignores the Ukrainian question, does not provide any point of reference, any support for the concept of Ukrainian liberation.

The confessors will only be able to make three arguments. The first: "What can we do, there is no other way out, no other road for us, this is the only way to actively engage in the global competition and thus gain some chances." The second argument is the following thinking: if only we were allowed to join their front. And then we will get our money's worth with our contribution, our right will be recognised. Finally, the third and most important argument is the hope that when it comes to war

America's policy will change completely, to a more useful one for our cause. They say that we cannot judge what will happen in a wartime situation on the basis of the current attitude of the time, because it is all just a tactic to avoid teasing the Bolsheviks too much with a different attitude to the Ukrainian question, to avoid burning bridges to compromise. But when the bridges are burned, our card will be trumped.

A closer look at all these arguments reveals their instability. It's not true that we have no other road and must cling to the only one, even if it is questionable. On the contrary. We have our own, which has been the path of our liberation struggle for the third decade in the most unfavourable circumstances. Despite all its efforts, the enemy could not destroy this struggle, and our struggle is constantly growing stronger, spreading, capturing new forces and gaining true allies. This is the path of our own revolutionary struggle, the liberation concept of Ukrainian nationalism. It also provides a solution for our independent policy and our own struggle in the situation that is emerging with the outbreak of another world war, with the current balance of power and attitudes towards Ukraine. The path outlined by the concept of the national liberation revolution not only exists, but it is the only real and successful one. This will be discussed further.

It is a pity to discuss the second motivation. "Stupid people are beaten in church too",

- Is this the answer to the hope that if we make a large contribution to the war of the Western powers against the Bolsheviks without respecting their interpretation of our aims at the outset, we will win their sympathy, understanding, then recognition of rights? Isn't our own and other people's experience enough? Let us take the experience of several nations from the last war, which had treaties and solemn commitments in advance, whose independence was ensured in all the pacts and was in the first place in the goals of the Allied war, and then those nations gained freedom... Bolshevik freedom. Poland, the Czech Republic, and Serbia achieved this by fighting together with very partners we were supposed to be serving, with the difference that they were given guarantees from above that we had to earn for ourselves.

Some will say that it was a different situation, that America and England had to give up their allies - Poland, the Czech Republic and Serbia - to the stronger ally Russia, that it will be different now, because Russia must be defeated. We disagree with the statement that the Western powers had to

to do so. This would probably not have happened if they had treated the cause of those nations as seriously and passionately as their own. When the Bolsheviks tried to "help" Persia in a similar way immediately after the war, England and America reacted so decisively that the Bolsheviks had to turn back. It was about oil and the immediate interests of Great Britain. This is not to say that England and America are bad allies, because there are many examples of this in history, in relations between different nations. The point is to draw the right conclusions and take into account the factors and principles of international relations that actually work, rather than play with naive hopes and sentiments.

Similarly, I do not have to respectfully accept the allegedly cunning, but in fact naive arguments that the most important thing is that we are allowed to fight, to supply our armed forces, and then they will be able to create the perfect facts, regardless of the wishes of the leading powers. We need to understand the following things: the Ukrainian military formation that could be created outside Ukraine in the face of Western allies, including even eventual replenishment from prisoners, would be small compared to the huge military masses. It cannot play such a role as to force America and Britain to change their fundamental guidelines of the entire military policy for the sake of it and its struggle. Moreover, included in the Allied military machine, as a regular unit and with the way of fighting of a regular army, a Ukrainian military unit, no matter how large, will have much less effective combat potential than this number of soldiers would have had fighting in a guerrilla way in the Ukrainian revolutionary struggle on their native lands, in the UPA.

Furthermore, within the framework of the allied forces, a Ukrainian military unit will be deprived of initiative and will only follow the orders of the main command. And in the course of warfare, it will implement the policy dictated by the governments of the great powers. And if they do not want the Ukrainian factor to create the final facts, it will be easy to make sure that there is no physical capacity for this, for example, that at the relevant time this army is not in Ukraine at all.

Therefore, there is no point in fooling ourselves with the fantasy that such an army, wedged into someone else's military machine, can create its own fait accompli of greater significance. It can act in that direction along the lines of

the intentions of the factor that drives the war, whether they are explicit or implicit, and how it can be given freedom of action in situations and areas where it does not want to decide, but allows free play and the play of other forces. In such situations, it can be very useful to have a military force that has all the qualities of a military formation forged in war in terms of organisation, weapons and military experience, to consolidate Ukrainian statehood, to protect Ukrainian ethnographic territories, to organise an army, .

Similarly, it will be very important for the liberation cause and for the construction of the Ukrainian state to have an appropriate number of military personnel of various ranks and with various types of weapons, who will improve in military affairs, and who will acquire the knowledge and skills that are being taught by high-ranking armies of various states. Both are important, and attention should be paid to these matters. But they need to be put in their proper place, interpreted according to their essence. This is not a question of the liberation concept, but only a question of auxiliary, albeit ultimate, factors.

The third set of arguments is that the previous position of the United States and other Western powers in the Ukrainian case, a position of complete neglect, does not matter for their attitude during the war. Up to now, there has been a policy of not irritating the Bolsheviks and making concessions, and with a change in this course will come a positive interpretation of our case.

If we look for real grounds for such statements, it turns out that there are none, that these are just pious wishes and hopes without solid ground. Undoubtedly, such a reversal would be very desirable for our cause, and foreign action, the efforts of the entire emigration, should do everything possible to make it happen. If this were to happen, it would be easy to adjust our policy to a more favourable attitude of external forces. But we should not base our hopes on mere expectations when the reality is quite different.

Those who rely on a change in America's posture invoke the logic and rationale of its own anti-Bolshevik policy, as they see it in time of war, to assure the Western powers of victory. They said: "but it cannot be otherwise. The Western powers cannot wage war against the USSR without including the liberation struggle of the sub-Soviet peoples on the same front; they must

to make the goal of the war the liberation of all peoples, Ukraine. After all, everyone knows that Hitler lost the war in the East mainly because he had a negative attitude to the cause of independence for Ukraine and other nations. America will not repeat his mistakes, especially since it does not have the same motives; it cannot enslave or occupy Ukraine, and there is no reason why Ukraine's independence would be undesirable for it."

People base their hopes on such logical arguments. From our point of view, this is logical, and an objective assessment of the political interests of Western powers speaks for it. But logic often does not have a decisive voice in the politics of nations, and many times things happen that are quite clearly at odds with objective expediency. In order to correctly predict what kind of policy a nation will pursue, it is necessary to take into account those existing, existing and potential factors in its political thinking and development that will have a decisive influence in a given situation.

What logic, what rationale can be used to justify the policy of unprincipled pacting and completely unnecessary concessions of the Western powers, with America at the head, against Bolshevik Russia? In the name of what ideas did they treat the Bolsheviks, after the war, as their allies and turn a blind eye to the fact that they were dealing with the worst tyranny, with murderers and with a system of the greatest crimes against God, against man, against nations, against all freedom and all values?

Why, for what, even the smallest, personal benefit, did they agree to the fact that Russia not only took the lion's share of the military victory, but also conquered other new nations, including their allies? Why did they tolerate for so long the fact that the Bolsheviks were conquering more and more countries, increasing their potential immensely, and exploiting everything they had conquered, turning all their forces and means into an unprecedented war machine directed against the rest of the world, including the Western powers themselves? What made them accept everything so passively and at the same time seek cooperation with the Bolsheviks? Did they not understand or see this?

If one believes this, how can one explain that for several years the West plugged its ears and closed its eyes in order not to hear or see what was shown and said by all the witnesses who had learned Bolshevism to the core, lived through it, and showed the consequences of its work on the bodies of their peoples!

What have the ruling and leading circles of Western states done to enable

to the emigrants of the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism, so that those societies could learn the truth about Russian-Communist imperialism?

Such questions can be asked endlessly, and they will be asked by history, and perhaps by the present generation of the Western nations themselves. For in the inevitable war they will have to make terrible sacrifices under the blows of the power that their policies allowed and helped the Bolsheviks to forge and increase with the blood and sweat of enslaved peoples. Where is the answer to these questions? Neither logic, nor the rationale of self-interest, nor political expediency, nor conscience, nor responsibility can provide a stable answer. But all of this did happen, these are real facts. And they have their reasons, they are driven by some forces and laws that operate in the politics of the West today. And this what we are talking about. We are not raising these issues here to bring accusations, because this is not our role, and no words have any meaning in this matter unless they are connected to terrible deeds. But here we are talking about our understanding of reality, our assessment of it, and our conclusions for ourselves. Because the right conclusions determine the right path.

The entire post-war policy of the Western powers, and in particular their attitude to the Ukrainian case, cannot be commemorated and put aside as a temporary tactic, or even as a mistake that has passed and will not be repeated. On the other hand, it would be equally fake to say to ourselves, "this is a hopeless situation" and conclude that "we cannot expect anything good from the West and its war with the USSR". The one and the other interpretation of the case is not substantive, but superficial and moody, and both lead astray. We need to critically analyse the developments of the last decade and separate the transient phenomena, elements of tactics, searching, etc. from the deeper, more lasting causes. Particular attention should be paid to such motives, forces, laws and methods in the political thought and action of Western nations that have a lasting influence, which have determined their attitude to Ukraine's affairs so far and will continue to do so in the future. Only on this basis can we predict their attitude to us in different situations.

We will not engage in such an analysis here, nor will we attempt to systematise these factors. We would like to point out some of them that are important for answering the question of whether the war will change the West's attitude to

of liberating Ukraine in the way we would like, that is, from ourselves, which is what the political concept discussed here wants to rely on.

In the entire postwar policy of the West against the USSR, the United States played a leading role. It will be the same in the war against the Bolsheviks. America's position will be more or less in proportion to its military contribution, and this will dominate not only because of its greatest natural potential, but also because of the targeted guidance of its partners. development goes along the lines of conflict with the USSR, England, followed by other European powers, deliberately gives America the initiative, and slowly joins in. This is one of the inhibiting factors in the formation of a firm stance of the West against the USSR. England wants the future war to be clearly a US war, and it will be its ally and help. In relation to that, America's contribution and losses would have to be much greater (thus the weight between the two sisters would have to be reversed, as it was in the last war). Moreover, in the Ukrainian case, which is underestimated by the West, England and other states will not argue with America unless and until it becomes a measurable, respectable figure for the West. This leads us to the conclusion that America will set the tone for the Ukrainian cause during the war, so we must take into account its guidance, and it can be generalised. The differences in the situation of other belligerent states can only be taken into account in purely practical matters, not in the question of the general political line.

The second point that needs to be considered is that the physical law of powerlessness is very much at work in US politics, in the sense that it is very difficult and very slow to change the chosen direction and scope, its policy changes only as the change is ripe for public opinion. And in this case, the perception, awareness and assessment of such facts, phenomena and processes that do not have a direct, tangential relationship to the life of an American citizen, or do not have a visual reflection in America, is again very slow. There are many reasons for this, such as historical development, geopolitical position, the structure of the spiritual and political life of America, and many others. It can be argued that changes in US politics take place in big, slow twists and turns, and it takes very strong external impulses or great internal tensions to cause such changes. But a US policy that is set in motion in a certain direction does not

is easy to stop. For example, let's remember how long and how hard America was "swayed" to participate in the Second World War, what forces were working on it, and how Pearl Harbour finally swayed it. And then, when Roosevelt decided on an alliance with the USSR, he established the democratic public opinion in trust and cordiality towards Bolshevik Russia in such a way that it took five years to work it off, even with the taunts and provocations with which the USSR treated allied America. In accordance with the inflexibility of the political opinion of their citizens, in the problems that lie ahead for them, and from domestic political reviews, the US leaders are trying to avoid anything that is new and not yet worn out in the public eye.

From this sign in the mechanics of American politics, we can draw important conclusions. The first, positive, is that when public opinion in North America has already turned away from the disastrous alliance and peaceful coexistence with Bolshevism at any cost and is accelerating along the lines of a firm course, American policy cannot easily change it, cannot be reversed through diplomatic manoeuvres. This largely ensures that the international situation will develop for the better.

The second conclusion is that those political concepts that are now being inculcated and established in the public opinion of America, with the prospect of a future military play, will have primacy and advantage in active politics, in shaping the political strategy of Western states. In contrast, anything new and unknown will have great difficulty in gaining the favour of American policy if it is opposed by forces and currents that are already recognised. This point dashes hopes that with the outbreak of war, America will take a positive view of the Ukrainian liberation struggle. If nothing is happening in this direction now, and on the contrary, political preparations are going along a different line, following Russian inspirations hostile to Ukraine, this is a fairly certain sign that American policy will go in the wrong direction.

A third conclusion should be drawn from these statements to the question of methods of independent political work in the United States. Regardless of the ability and success of imposing political ties with official factors on so-called diplomatic work, the entire Ukrainian emigration in America, all Ukrainian institutions, societies, and every Ukrainian should do the following on a daily basis

by all means possible to inform the public, every American citizen, about the Ukrainian liberation struggle, to instil in them an understanding and a favourable attitude towards our cause. If the Ukrainian emigration in America is able to gain the public support of America in the right way, in different positions and by different means, then the most lasting political work will be done in this field and it will be beneficial in due time.

The most important prediction of what America's attitude to the Ukrainian cause might look like during the war will be to consider the foundations of its political conception of war with the USSR, which are already beginning to develop, and the American assessment of the factors at work in the current USSR complex. These are the most realistic data for drawing our conclusions.

In the policy of the Western powers during the war with the USSR, the main role will be played by the desire to destroy the military and political power of Bolshevik imperialism as quickly and easily as possible, with the least possible casualties.

The question of a new order in the space occupied by Bolshevism would be in the background of Anglo-American policy until the outcome of the war was decided. It will be treated not as an inherent goal of the war, but rather as a means to reduce and stir up the strength of the enemy camp and to bring some forces to their side. Thus, the position of America and England in this matter will be determined primarily by how they view the existing forces in the sub-Bolshevik world, their attitudes and potential in the war, how much they should be taken into account, who can be an ally and who can be neutralised.

Western nations have no real idea and no correct assessment of the actual situation in the territories occupied by Moscow. Not only in the concepts of the average citizen, but also in the views of the ruling circles, the messages that Russia, white and red alike, stubbornly pushes on the entire outside world, closing off the reality, are rooted.

In the West, they see only Russia. Some people do not know or know very little about the fact that it has used military aggression to subjugate and violently take over many peoples who have not and never reconcile themselves to that enslavement. Others, though they know something about

the multinational composition of the present-day USSR, still refer almost exclusively to the Russian people as the only subject. The peoples enslaved by Russia are generally treated in the West not as full-fledged and self-conscious nations struggling for their independent life, but as ethnic tribes that are only passive objects in Moscow's hands, who have either already spent their national and political selves in the Russian-Bolshevik kettle or have not yet developed it. Still other politicians of Western countries, still under the same delusion, underestimate the true value and potential of the independent struggle of the peoples enslaved by Russia, compare this potential, which is hidden before the world, with the propagandised Russian potential, and place their bets on Russia.

All this would not have been possible if the illusion had not been accepted and spread in the Western world that the Russian people and Bolshevik imperialism are two separate things, that the Russian people are not the bearers but only the victims of the latter, that in the struggle against Bolshevism it is possible to have a part of the Russian people, and a large part of them, as an ally. This misconception is spread in the West by the Muscovites, by the entire political work of the Russian emigration, and even more so by influential circles of the Western nations themselves, who, with frivolous loyalty or for petty tactical purposes, have directed the public opinion and policy of their countries in this false direction.

In France, England, America, Canada and other Western countries there are also units who know the real state of affairs, who are well versed in the affairs of sub-Bolshevik Europe and Asia, who know the essence of Bolshevism and Russian imperialism, who understand the liberation struggles of the enslaved peoples, and who appreciate their value and strength. These few are trying to spread a true understanding of these affairs among their peoples and to influence the direction of Western policy. But such voices still remain the voice of "crying in the wilderness".

Despite all the Bolshevik and venal, disguised pro-Bolshevik propaganda, some truths about Bolshevism are slowly being established in the political consciousness of Western peoples under the influence of the clear facts with which the USSR has been so generously showering its recent allies since the end of the Second World War. The West is already realising that the Bolshevik march to subjugate the world is an offensive of Russian imperialism and communism. The knowledge of the truth is maturing that

Bolshevism has these two inseparable components - Russian imperialism, of which it is the most reckless form up to that time, and communism, as a form of its implementation, a tool for its universal spread. Both of these elements now form an inseparable whole, a unity. Bolshevism was as much the highest stage of Russian imperialism as it was a consistent embodiment of communism. It is one phenomenon with two genetic elements and two ways of acting outwards.

The healthy forces of the Western nations know that both elements of Bolshevism - Russian imperialism and communism - are a threat to all other nations. Therefore, one might have hoped that the policies of the Western great powers, with the aim of protecting their own peoples and historical responsibility, would adopt as their general line a resolute rejection and uncompromising negation of Bolshevism in both its elements. In reality, the attitude of the Western powers towards both communism and Russian imperialism cannot be anything but negative.

But American and British politics choose a different general line of political play with Bolshevism. Targeting Bolshevism as the most dangerous combination of Russian imperialism and communism, it seeks ways to separate this combination, to drive a wedge between them, and to ally each of these factors (if they act separately), or at least to neutralise them. This is the main concept of a political war with the USSR, which the policies of America and Britain are clearly choosing, preparing and beginning to implement. The political war is in fact already underway, and the current positions taken by both sides determine the lines of political fronts at the beginning of the military massacre.

The Western powers intend to fight communism only in such manifestations where it clearly serves Bolshevik imperialism. When it acts completely separately, separating itself from Moscow, or in some kind of conflict with it, then it is indulged. Behind this is the desire to make some kind of vilim in the enemy camp.

This line of policy is evident, first of all, against Tito. Although his entire practice of internal regime, terror, collectivisation, the fight against religion and the substitution of Marxism in its place, etc., is taken directly from Bolshevism, the West turns a blind eye to all this and justifies Titus on the grounds of his disagreement with the Kremlin emperors.

In Western policy, there are more facts that lie along the same lines of seeking some kind of understanding with the communists who are disobedient to Moscow. The disastrous policy of America and England in the whole development of events in China in recent years, the connivance with the Communist offensive, the ineffective support of the Chinese national forces, the attempt to establish good relations and trade with Red China it showed its teeth - all this shows that we are dealing with a broader concept of the Western powers' own policy, and not just with side-tracking for sabotage in the enemy camp.

This is a bet on the so-called national communism, on the fact that communist movements in individual countries will want to emancipate themselves from Moscow's hegemony, to separate from it, and to defend the sovereignty of their communist states. The West would like to impose good relations with them, especially economic relations, and gradually cut off their ties with the USSR. Titus's dispute with the Kremlin made this concept very fashionable in the West, giving it the gloss of high political wisdom. It paved the way for a policy of extreme opportunism against the communist offensive in China. England and America hoped that Mao Zedong would follow Titus and that this would result in a great triumph for their merchant policy. Now it is clear to everyone who outsmarted whom. Yet, in speculative politics, which seeks to get out of a difficult historical test by various means, this concept of betting on non-imperialist splinter communism continues to exist and spread the chatter.

An equally misleading and disastrous concept in American and British policy is the reliance on the separation of the imperialist tendencies of the Russian people from Bolshevism. In the West, they pretend that imperialist aspirations are inherent in the Russian nation, that they invariably live and act in all its internal fractures. To be clearly hostile to Russian imperialism means to have the entire Russian people against you. And although the Western nations understand that the expansionist imperialism of all Russia is competing to conquer ever greater spaces and is measuring against their interests and security, their policies are dominated by the desire to free themselves first and foremost from the deadly threat of Bolshevism, the worst form of Russian imperialism. Fear of a total massacre of the entire

Russia is telling them to accept the concept of fighting only Bolshevism in such a way as not to mobilise the entire Russian people, but if possible, to bring a significant part of them to their side, or at least to demobilise their military . To this end, they do not want to touch upon the imperialist aspirations of the Russian nation, but rather to provide clear evidence that they are not engaged in this, treat it as an inviolable matter of the Russian people themselves, and want only their liberation from Bolshevism and the establishment of a democratic system.

For us, it is quite clear that this concept is not only wrong, because it does not provide any historical solution, but that it is also unrealistic. Bolshevism gives the most powerful development and fulfilment to Russian imperialist aspirations, creates the form and prepares the ground for the conquest of the whole world, makes Moscow, the Russian people, the centre and leader of communised humanity. Who and how can compete with him in this? It fuels the imperialist drive of the Russian nation to such an extent that no "middle ground" matters. This imperialism can only be either completely denied, fought against, and defeated in an all-out war with Russia, or given unbridled freedom, as Bolshevism does.

Attempts to circumvent this alternative, to strike at Bolshevism without teasing the indigenous Russian imperialist drive, have always been and will always be a policy of self-deception, a false bet. Similarly, it is unrealistic to count on the commitment, or at least the impartiality, of any part of the true communists during the war against Bolshevism, anywhere. Against all internal conflicts in the communist camp and against all tactical attempts by the Western powers stands the obvious fact that only Russian Bolshevism has put world communism on its feet, and with its fall the fate of communism throughout the world will be sealed.

But in the politics of Western countries, this is treated quite differently. What we regard as unrealistic is considered possible in their politics; their politicians look from the outside at what we see from the inside, judge on the basis of superior observations and information they receive, interpretations of the enemy's creature, which we know intimately from experience.

Politicians in America and England are encouraged to adopt this concept by their

the desire to find the easiest way to deal with Bolshevism, a way that would require fewer victims and costs, even if it did not completely resolve the situation, but only significantly defuse it and reduce the danger. This should be the first concept of political warfare, and maybe it will work. If not, then there is always the final option in reserve - to fight all the constituent elements of Bolshevism openly and uncompromisingly, regardless of the forms and scope of their actions. That is, a total political war with Russia, with Russian imperialism of all colours and with communism of all kinds.

But such a struggle, in the estimation of Anglo-American politics, will be much more difficult, will cost more victims, because the enemy camp will then be larger and stronger. Therefore, this path can only be taken in the final analysis, when the first one is really unsuitable. And this should be revealed only in war. Thus, from the point of view of the Western powers, it is a question of the degree of breadth and sharpness in the formulation of a political war with the USSR, not an alternative choice between two opposing concepts.

The West does not really add such an "either/or"; the transition from one plan to another seems simple, and even more so, developmentally consistent. In particular, in view of the political and moral mobilisation of the Western nations, which is not based on preserving integrity and uncompromisingly defending the basic principles of international relations and universal ideas, but only by demonstrating that all attempts at harmony and compromise with Bolshevism are unsuccessful because it does not want this, but consistently strives to subdue the world. With regard to the enemy camp, it is also more useful for them to narrow the front, at least at first. Other factors are not properly taken into account by Anglo-American policy.

We have already pointed out that this policy implies almost exclusively the Russian people as a factor to be taken into account. Other forces, such as the liberation struggles of the peoples enslaved by Moscow, are not properly understood. Those peoples who had independent states before the Second World War are taken into account in some way, while others are treated as insignificant or unknown factors. When, in some places, they begin to think that the

the potential of the anti-Bolshevik liberation struggle of Ukraine and other peoples, they consider it to be a permanent factor that should not be taken into account in the development of their own plans, because it has no choice - it is fighting against Russia and will do so in every situation. Therefore, they want to take our struggle into account as an additional factor that could be easily helped if it does not attract compliments in other areas, but for which we do not have to try hard.

The policy of America and England still does not include the requirement that the concept of war with the USSR should take into account the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other peoples. Quite the contrary, this policy norms its attitude to our struggle by trying to win the sympathy of the Russian people, taking into account their hostility to the communist regime. Only in this sense does it interpret the question of the choice between Russia and the nations that have long been at war with it. We will not argue here with facts that Western powers have adopted this approach. Anyone who wants to verify this thesis will find plenty of such facts.

In the political endeavours of American influential circles, which are the preparation of military policy, there is a clear line of courting the non-communist masses towards Russian imperialism. Not only in the way that they try not to tease it, not to associate it with clearly imperialist, allegedly anti-communist Russian factors. But more than that, there are clear attempts to squeeze the liberation struggles of the peoples enslaved by Russia into the Russian cauldron, to bring them under the Russian rudder, to drain them of their basic message against all imperialist Russia and to bring them to a common denominator with the Russian "white" imperialists in a front only against the communist regime. What does this indicate? Ignorance of the matter, misunderstanding of the true relations has nothing to do with it. Because even with the usual merchant approach, it is better to deal separately with two opposing forces, to have two bets and the ability to "quote" them, than to force them together to deal with one, and a very dubious partner. No, here the US policy shows a good knowledge of the fact that the whole Russian people are imbued with imperialism, and domination over the defeated nations is the most important thing for Russia. And secondly, this policy wants to show that

Russia has no intention of trampling on the independence aspirations of Ukraine and other nations, but only wants to see them continue to be in Russia's "brotherly embrace". It is well known that Russians are not easily persuaded to take sides, and verbal statements alone will not help, you need proof of facts - it is good that there is someone to show them.

In the context of this concept, we would have to play the following role: to fight as hard as possible against the Bolsheviks, on the same front, under the hand of the same "big brother" - the Muscovite, only against the Bolshevik regime, for democracy. In order not to "break the common front," we should not yet talk about state independence or the division of Russia. We can think about this and speak in our own ears. In the meantime, the floor belongs to the Russians, who will talk about the "unity of the Russian peoples". And then we will see. First of all, we need to overthrow Bolshevism and earn ourselves some merit.

It's not cooked for us, there's no need to take up spoons. We've been through this before, and more than once. The last time the Nazis tried it, at the end of their lame "millennium" (Hitler promised the Germans in his speeches and writings to create such a powerful state (the "Reich") that it would last for a millennium. But that "millennium" soon turned out to be too "short" indeed, hence the author's allusion.), to recruit our brother for such a Vlasovian "concept".

For Russia, this line of Anglo-American policy is just to its liking. And it is quite to the advantage of both types of Russian imperialists, the "anti-communists" and the Bolsheviks. Because there can be no harm in that. Bolshevism is quite sure of the Russians, it has tuned the imperialist strings of the Russian nation so well that no one is equal to it in playing this instrument. When its opponents try to play it themselves, it is only proof that the instrument is good, and then it will be revealed which of them are bad musicians. In war, every failure of the enemy is worth the price of your own victory.

The main benefit for Russia, and for Bolshevism, is that in way the Western powers remove the inappropriate posture against the anti-Russian liberation struggles of the enslaved peoples.

The Bolsheviks, like all Russian imperialists, are well aware of the mortal threat to the Russian Empire posed by the struggle of Ukraine and other nations for their own state independence.

The support of these struggles by the Western powers, and even more so the coordination of their war with these liberation struggles into a single front, for the true liberation of all nations, for their independent states, for the collapse of the Moscow prison of the peoples, would finally and soon bring the Russian Empire to an end. To avert this greatest threat and to direct the military policy of the Western powers on a different, unsuccessful path is entirely a matter of the first importance of Bolshevik military plans. It is even worth arranging complex games and political sabotage.

It is clear that all Russian emigrant imperialists will concentrate their efforts on this. They doing this and will do so automatically, without exception and regardless of their true attitude to Bolshevism. For this purpose they do not need any understanding, because they are all united with Bolshevism by the main desire to preserve the empire at the expense of further enslaving the defeated peoples, and by the greatest hatred for our liberation struggle.

But it is not only the emigrant, so-called white Russian forces that will ensure that American policy follows this erroneous path. The arguments and promises that Russian emigrants use to justify the policies of Western powers can quickly lose their power when the war with the USSR reveals a completely different truth. Then the Bolsheviks may deliberately dissect and display facts that will be deliberately turned against them, but will not do them any serious harm, but will instead strengthen the political sabotage of "anti-communist" Russian forces, strengthen their influence and further divert the main offensive of the West in an uncharacteristic direction. In the course of military events, such insidious diversions are easier to create than in peaceful politics. The history of both world wars shows great intelligence combinations to divert the enemy's attention and actions to the wrong path. This was mainly in the area of military strategy. The Bolsheviks put the political side of the war first, trying to outwit and defeat the enemy, knowing that this would make military reprisals much easier. Thus, we should assume that in this war they will use the most refined political manoeuvres to "bring the enemy into the field".

Given this plausibility, one cannot easily rely on the fact that the policies of Western powers will turn away from

The Bolsheviks will be able to put the West the right track by seeing their mistake in the real facts. The Bolsheviks will create such confessional facts that the West can accept as real. We have to take into account the fact that Moscow's false semaphores can disorient the West for a long time in an area it does not know well.

This conception of a political war of the Western powers against the USSR is completely false and disastrous, both for the cause of the struggle against Bolshevism and for the peoples fighting on its behalf. It will lead to many victims in vain; the enemies of the USSR will look for a solution where there can be none, and meanwhile the most realistic opportunities to deal a fatal blow to the real enemy, Russian imperialism, by coordinating the war with the liberation struggle of the anti-Russian peoples will be missed.

If the Western powers wanted to wage war against the USSR on this basis, they would be depriving Ukraine and other peoples of the opportunity to link their liberation struggle with their war. In this case, our struggle would follow a completely separate, independent path, and the war of the Western powers would be worthwhile for us only because it would create favourable circumstances for the full unfolding of our own struggle.

Instead, the war itself in this formulation would not bring us liberation. The overthrow of Bolshevism itself, and the restoration of the Russian Empire in a new form in which Ukraine would continue to be enslaved by Russia, is not a solution for us. For us, such a cause is not worth the slightest sacrifice, let alone the enormous sacrifices that the war will cost our people and our country.

Linking the Ukrainian liberation cause to the war of the West against the USSR in this way would be extremely harmful because it would direct our forces and our liberation struggle to an inappropriate path on which there can be no success, and would turn away from the only right path - our own independent revolutionary struggle, for uncompromising goals, for the state sovereignty of Ukraine. It would also be harmful to the whole cause of the world struggle against Bolshevism. For our joining the war, which is hostile to us and inherently false in its political staging, would only contribute to its consolidation, and would blame our liberation struggle for its failures. In such a war, as the Third World War will be, the victory will be a political victory. Even if the Western powers had won militarily in the

political failure, if the Russian empire had remained intact, it would have been a loss to the West and all the anti-Russian forces that linked their fate to that war.

We need to do everything possible, by all means available to us, to turn the policy of Western powers away from such a pernicious concept of compromise with Russian imperialism, even in war. All Ukrainian independent political factors abroad, without regard to internal disagreements, the entire Ukrainian emigration, must use all available ways and means to reverse this errant direction in political circles and public opinion in Western nations and to make them follow the right path. This must be done every time, stubbornly, despite the lack of understanding and temporary dead ends. When the politics of America and England have become even more aware of Russian imperialism and communist snobbery, then our appeals will find at least some understanding.

But we cannot limit ourselves to explanations and appeals. Just as we cannot wait passively with our own struggle until the West understands us and appreciates us properly. Our struggle must go on with its own development, in other words, also with the expectation that the Western world will see its direction and its strength, so that it will come to the conclusion for itself of the importance of our struggle for the overthrow of imperialist Russia and communism.

But the formulation of our struggle and our entire independence policy must simultaneously have a very clear and emphatic opposition to Russian imperialism and communism of all kinds and under all kinds of masks. The Western powers must see clearly that there can be no question of any compromise, and they must have a choice: either an alliance with the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other peoples from our front, or a self-deceptive bet on the Russian people in their war with Russia. There is only one Russia - imperialist, and it will remain so until Russian imperialism is completely destroyed and the Russian people are cured of it through the knowledge that its imperialism brings them the greatest misery - victims, suffering and downfall. This is still a long way off; the Russian nation is now more imbued with red-hot imperialism than ever. Whoever makes a pact with such an imperialist Russia, whether white or red or of any other colour, forges his own shackles or downfall. Ukraine will not go along with this; our struggle for

independence from Moscow, the fight for sovereignty is an uncompromising, life-and-death struggle. And whoever does insist on some kind of alliance with Russia, no matter what the cost, we will not travel with them.

### ***National revolution is the only way to liberation***

The Third World War, just like the previous ones, will not bring Ukraine liberation and state independence by itself. The Western great powers, who will be the main opponents of the USSR in this war, do not include the liberation of Ukraine in the goals of the war, and their concept of political reprisal against Bolshevism does not give grounds for linking our liberation struggle to the fate of their war and putting it within its framework. This was discussed in previous articles.

The only way to achieve true liberation and state sovereignty for Ukraine is through the Ukrainian national revolution, the Ukrainian nation's own struggle against Moscow-Bolshevik enslavement. A nation enslaved by a foreign power can only achieve true and lasting liberation through its own struggle, through the exertion of all its forces in a life-and-death struggle.

A favourable situation, favour and assistance from outside forces can sometimes play a very significant role, but always only a supporting role, not the main one. Even the best opportunities and willingness to help will be useless if the nation itself does not fight and forge its own destiny through its own struggle.

The revolutionary forms and methods of struggle against Bolshevik enslavement and the Ukrainian national revolution, as a form of total war between Ukraine and the enslaving Russia, in Ukraine's current situation, are the only possible way of the liberation struggle, which is best guaranteed to succeed also because it allows for the gradual involvement of all the forces of the people in the struggle and strikes the enemy in such places and in such ways as to paralyse his power as much as possible. Only in a national revolution can the entire Ukrainian people launch a liberation struggle for their own goals, according to their own plan, put all their energy into it, and build their own system to replace the system of national and social enslavement that has been overcome.

If the Western powers during the war with the USSR had treated the cause of Ukraine's liberation and state independence correctly, interpreting

If it were to be used as one of the aims of the war, it would have as much real value and practical consequences as the Ukrainian people themselves, through their struggle, would help to overcome Bolshevik Moscow and shape their own independent life. And the only possible way to do this is through a national revolution.

Even if there was a desire to place all Ukrainian independence struggles within the framework of the military actions of the anti-Bolshevik bloc, only a small part of Ukrainian forces would have the practical ability to take an active part in the war. Instead, the revolutionary struggle activates all the forces of the nation, not only those on the other side of the front, but above all those in the sub-Bolshevik sphere, in the Soviet army, at the front and behind the lines, on Ukrainian lands and beyond.

The revolutionary struggle creates a second, very threatening front for the enemy, which destroys the enemy from within and cannot be localised. And from this point of view, a united national revolution will give Ukraine a position of a respected active factor in the world competition against Bolshevik imperialism.

Many people think that a revolution is impossible in the USSR because the system of terror, which penetrates and takes over all of life, all areas and all of its manifestations, by communist police and party functionaries, will never allow a revolution to emerge, organise and wage a broad struggle. Such a view, influenced by the belief in the omnipotence of Bolshevik terror and totalitarianism, does not allow for the possibility of the revolution unfolding in such a position and to such an extent that it would overthrow Bolshevism, or at least contribute to its overthrow. The notion of an anti-Bolshevik revolution in this sense, if it does not remain an empty phrase, is reduced to the concept of some kind of manifestation of sympathy and cooperation with the struggle of external forces against Bolshevism, and most importantly, it is limited to the elimination of the consequences and remnants of Bolshevism even after it has been expanded by these external forces in the war.

In our understanding, the anti-Bolshevik revolution is the overcoming of Bolshevism by the struggle of an entire nation from within, the destruction of the state of occupation and all forms of enslavement, the collapse of the USSR and the building of a free nation in a sovereign Ukrainian state.

The most important moment of the revolution is the struggle in all forms and in all areas of organised social life; first of all, the political and military struggle, which must turn from the permanent revolutionary action of underground forces, from the spontaneous revolutionary actions of ever wider circles organised by them, into a general uprising of the whole people. The revolution must first of all paralyse the strength of the enemy regime by capturing the masses with its ideas and struggle, which the Bolshevik regime is forcing into its military and total state machine, aimed at subjugating and enslaving the rest of the world. Revolutionary ideas and revolutionary actions must transform the masses of the people in the Soviet army, in collective farms, factories, and in total state life from obedient, though forced, executors of the regime's will into those who consciously and actively fight it. The ruling revolutionary organisation must direct the energy and action of the revolutionised masses to fight the inherent core of the hostile regime, its springs, its main carriers and loyal "defenders" - the NKVD, the Communist Party apparatus, the Russian imperialists, the promoters and executors of the whole system of terror and sexism. The goal of the struggle is to neutralise and eliminate the main factors of the hostile system and simultaneously create a new reality based on the ideas and plans for which the revolution is being raised.

Even the most extreme sceptics cannot deny the fact that in the USSR there is a basic basis for an anti-Bolshevik revolution - deep dissatisfaction of the broadest masses with the existing state of affairs, a hidden hostility to Bolshevism and its entire system. But they are right that this is not enough for the emergence and successful development of a revolution.

Here we are talking about a factor that could transform this discontent, which lurks in the deepest recesses, from a frozen potential form into a dynamic explosion. Spokespersons for the concept of such a revolution, which would be based on a single platform of negation of Bolshevism, assume that it is the war of the Western powers against the USSR and the corresponding propaganda from behind the front that will lead to a spontaneous and general anti-Bolshevik breakdown. Such a calculation is not necessary.

The war will not reduce the system of Bolshevik internal terror. Bolshevism to its very core

The Bolsheviks know full well that they will try to keep everything and everyone in the same shackles as before, with no lesser, only more intense methods of terror. The Bolsheviks know very well that internal revolution is their most terrible threat, and they will always appoint their most confident, reckless elements to fight every germ of it.

Propaganda from the other side of the front, even if it operated with correct and appealing appeals, but fundamentally responded to the most negative instruction against Bolshevism, would not be able to raise the masses to active revolutionary struggle; its effect would be weakened by the very psychological moment that it comes from outside the reach of Bolshevik terror, where it is easy to make good appeals. But to put them into practice, it requires not only a negative attitude to Bolshevik reality, and not only courage, but also an extraordinary dedication.

The revolutionary struggle against Bolshevism, in all circumstances, including in time of war, will require very great sacrifices and will be undertaken only by those who are consciously prepared for it, who dedicate themselves and all that is most precious to it. Such dedication and self-sacrifice cannot come from the most negative, from hatred of the existing state, of Bolshevism and its regime, nor from the call of external factors, even if they are in spirit and close to it, who do not themselves participate in the revolution but fight from the outside, using other, easier methods. This requires a great positive idea that will be able to inspire the greatest sacrifice and heroism among the masses, for which it is worth not only dying but also sacrificing your loved ones, for which no sacrifice is spared.

First and foremost, the revolutionary activation of the masses requires an active revolutionary force that leads the struggle itself, sets an example, shows the way, draws ever wider circles into the current of its struggle, gives it direction, organises it, and leads it. Without this, the revolutionary potential of the masses - the hostility against Bolshevism and the desire for its downfall - cannot be transformed into dynamic action, struggle, and uprising.

Even in the midst of military events, it would remain ineffective; Bolshevism's latent opponents, harnessed to its totalitarian state-military machine, would passively wait for its fall from external attacks, doing what they were forced to do by Bolshevism's terror when

There is no way to get away from this, their hostility to Bolshevik rule would be manifested first of all in an attempt to evade doing his will wherever possible, or, if possible, to do it as poorly as possible, and then in an attempt to individually get beyond the Bolsheviks' power. But these attempts would generally have the character of an individual rather than an organised collective act, and would be along the lines of more personal self-preservation, as a self-dedication to a higher cause.

Taken together, this passive-negative attitude and covert, subtle sabotage of the Bolshevik regime's plans and orders can weaken and to some extent undermine the Bolshevik war effort and benefit its external opponents, but no more. It not deal a fatal blow to Bolshevism as long as it is still standing and has its teeth. Opponents of Bolshevism with such an attitude will spontaneously attack it only when it is already defeated by external forces. (Just as the Ukrainian "democrats" consolidated in exile are still fighting against fascist totalitarianism, without even lifting a finger against it when it has not yet been defeated).

But it would not be an anti-Bolshevik revolution, only auxiliary work for the non-front, rear units. There will be no spontaneous (in the sense of unorganised) anti-Bolshevik revolution in the USSR on the basis of the anti-regime attitude itself, and it will not be caused by war or any propaganda from outside. Any hopes for this are self-deceiving expectations or deliberate false speculations to create a stir, including to defraud external factors.

In the sub-Bolshevik reality, only an organised revolution for the realisation of a great positive idea is possible and real.

This idea, which sets a great positive goal, which awakens and fuels what is constantly living in the people, from generation to generation, what has been the engine of their most powerful uplifts and what no enemy has been able to crush by any means, is the national idea of freedom, liberation from foreign national and social enslavement, free life and comprehensive development of the nation, all its forces and citizens in a sovereign and united state. This idea has always been the strongest in Ukraine, it has lived in the Ukrainian people in all

The idea has been in a phase of great excitement and tension since the last national and political revival, since the restoration of Ukrainian state life and the liberation struggle in its defence.

Having conquered and enslaved Ukraine with armed violence, Bolshevik Moscow could not destroy or crush the Ukrainian idea, and in its terrorist enslavement it also uses methods of deception, replacing this idea with its own falsity.

The idea of Ukrainian nationalism not only denies and fights the existing state of Bolshevik domination in Ukraine, Russian imperialism and communism in its entirety, in all its manifestations, but it constitutes its own goal, its own ideal of the organisation and development of life in Ukraine, in accordance the nature and needs of the Ukrainian nation. This is a permanent, original goal that does not serve to deny Bolshevism as a counterpoint, but which is itself the source, the basis of that denial. The Ukrainian national idea is innate, inherent in the entire Ukrainian people, in every unspoilt Ukrainian person. And the organised national education, political and social work of the nationalist movement nurtures it, develops it into national political consciousness and activity.

In the sub-Bolshevik reality of total enslavement and terror, the development of the national idea takes place in its purest form in the actions of the Ukrainian nationalist, revolutionary underground and its influence on the entire Ukrainian nation, and is also squeezed through various cracks in the existing sub-Bolshevik life.

Similarly, other peoples enslaved by Moscow have a national idea that is crushed but not broken, ready to explode - the idea of independence, of the state independence of each nation. And these positive, indigenous ideas are the inherent dynamite of the anti-Bolshevik revolution. All of them together have a common moment of expression: the destruction of Bolshevism, the collapse of the Russian Empire of the USSR and the creation of independent national states. The revolution in the USSR will be carried out by the independent forces of the enslaved peoples, primarily Ukraine. They will be the only ones who will be able to summon up the appropriate, heroism and dedication in the name of their own great national ideas, and, despite great sacrifices, will raise a revolutionary struggle and uprising. When the fire of revolution breaks out from a few fires, then it will gradually engulf the whole

anti-Bolshevik element, and then the whole negative attitude to Bolshevism will become a dynamic form, a struggle.

In Ukraine and other countries enslaved by Moscow, the anti-Bolshevik revolution will have a clear national liberation character. The elimination of the Bolshevik regime and the communist system will simultaneously be the elimination of Russian domination, all its forms, its bearers and executors. Along with the destruction of the long-term, enemy-imposed state, the creation, defence and consolidation of a sovereign national state and the restoration of independent national life will go hand in hand. National political liberation will be simultaneously a socio-economic liberation.

An anti-Bolshevik revolutionary breakthrough may occur in Muscovy after the revolutionary uprisings of the enslaved peoples rise, spread successfully, and Bolshevism is no longer able to crush them. From there, the revolution could spread to the Moscow people. There, it would have a social and anti-regime character - the elimination of the Bolshevik system and the Bolshevik regime.

But at the same time, Moscow's imperialism will raise its head again, perhaps in several different forms, probably in the anti-Bolshevik revolution, and will turn its full force against the liberation revolutions of other peoples, especially against Ukraine. There are no signs that anti-imperialist tendencies are growing in the Russian people, which could give the anti-Bolshevik revolution a different, non-imperialist direction. Therefore, we must take into account the fact that all Russian forces, both Bolsheviks and anti-Bolsheviks, will fight the liberation revolution of Ukraine and other peoples.

It is possible that Russian opponents of Bolshevism in the midst of the revolution, when the elms of the empire are cracking, will turn their full force against national revolutions, leaving the fight against the Bolsheviks in the background. First and foremost, they will try to seize the initiative and the steering wheel, to stop the development of national revolutions, to pull out the sting of the anti-Bolshevik revolution against Russian imperialism and to turn it into a revolution against the Bolshevik regime and its system.

Another decisive factor for the emergence and development of the revolution,

Apart from the positive national idea, there is the existence and action of an organised revolutionary force that conducts the revolutionary struggle itself, develops and spreads the liberation idea, initiates, organises and wages a broad revolutionary struggle with the participation of the masses, which will develop into a general uprising. Without this, a revolution is impossible in conditions such as those under Bolshevik rule, even during war. The struggle of an underground organised force makes the liberation idea alive, gives it dynamics and inspires faith in its realisation. This struggle of an underground organisation is already a concrete, working link in the revolution, which will gain more and more strength, and will spread its actions with the active involvement of more and more masses. For every person who is passionate about the idea of liberation and wants to take part in this struggle, the active revolutionary underground provides a real opportunity and a way to join, including instructions on what to do and how to do it.

Without this, the revolution in the USSR would have been impossible. Even a significant intensity of the national, liberation idea among the masses, the readiness to fight, would have been useless without an active organised cell. Every person who wanted to fight would have faced the question of what to do and how to do it. Acting alone at random would not lead to anything; unless you started to organise something yourself. And the whole Bolshevik system of sexism, provocation and terror is designed to force each individual to hide his or her small-minded thoughts in the deepest recesses of his or her soul, to sow mutual distrust, to make it impossible for those who are hostile to Bolshevism to get to know each other, to understand each other and to organise for joint action.

The emergence of an appropriate revolutionary organisation with a great, mobilising idea, a system of organisation that would counter the refined methods of the NKVD, and tactics of struggle that were more advanced than the Bolsheviks, and which would gain the necessary trust of the people through its actions, is the most difficult thing on the path of revolution in sub-Bolshevik reality.

But such an organisation already exists and has had the most difficult experiences. The Ukrainian nationalist revolutionary underground, the UPA and OUN, not only survived five years of isolated struggle in the most difficult conditions, when the Bolsheviks tried to eliminate it by all means, but also consolidated and expanded its mission. Today, the UPA and OUN have the following improved, sophisticated

conditions and hostile methods, how to fight and organise, and that the NKVD does not intend to destroy the Ukrainian revolutionary movement. The five years of struggle since the end of the war have cost many painful sacrifices, but its consequences are even greater. The Ukrainian national revolution has a solid foundation for its further development.

The biggest obstacle to the development of the revolutionary struggle is the belief that underground forces cannot exist in the sub-Bolshevik reality and that any attempt at revolutionary struggle is futile. By eliminating insurgent and underground organisations in Ukraine, completed by the SVU and SUM processes, and by taking internal terror and sexism to their extreme limits, the NKVD managed to spread this message. Now the struggle between the OUN and the UPA continues unabated, and in a way that cannot be localised or concealed. It is already known in the farthest reaches of the USSR. Under the influence of this struggle and the information about it, a deep, very important for the success of the revolution, peril is being dug in the thinking of the broadest masses.

It shows that both the NKVD and the entire Bolshevik terror are not so omnipotent; that there is an organised force of liberation fighters who, by their moral strength, stand above everything that Bolshevism opposes them.

But not only do they have the moral high ground, because their struggle reveals their superiority in practical, effective terms. The content of the struggle of the Ukrainian underground is gaining the highest trust and approval among the people. This means that the cause of the revolution is a good and great cause, a people's cause, and its leadership is in good hands.

Considering the impact of war on the development of the revolution, there are many useful aspects of war that create more favourable circumstances. The war will force the regime to turn its main forces to external fronts. Military events will repeatedly disrupt the functioning of the Bolshevik machine, create new internal difficulties and crises. The internal readiness to join the active revolutionary struggle will rise significantly in the average person who has to go to the front or is otherwise directly exposed to the danger of military action. The disturbing effect of the instinct of self-preservation, which is very strong in a peaceful situation, will be reduced. In a war, throwing a person to the front, particularly with Moscow's method of ruthlessness, is no less fraught with death,

than to join the anti-Bolshevik partisans fighting the enemy instead of defending it. War provides great opportunities to acquire weapons and military material necessary for wider military operations. During the war, the Soviet army itself, with its composition and morale under twofold pressure from the front and the NKVD, will be a reservoir of great expansive potential, which, under the influence of the revolutionary flame from the underground and insurgent units, can explode into an anti-Bolshevik uprising.

The war between the USSR and its Western allies could develop in such a way that at first the Soviet armies would advance, occupy new countries, and the fronts would be able to stabilise for some time far from the current borders of the USSR, while the Western allies would use their planes to exhaust and harass the enemy from the mountains, at sea, and with various raids.

Such a war is very possible, in particular if it came earlier, while large armies were mobilised in Western Europe.

Regardless of how far from Ukraine's borders the fronts are, the Ukrainian revolutionary struggle will unfold according to its own plan, using the appropriate moments of each situation. It will not be confined to Ukrainian lands, but will spread to other countries, in which the OUN and UPA will play a prominent role.

The decisive phase of the liberation revolution can have several options. Concentrating on the Ukrainian lands in the form of an uprising, the Ukrainian revolution can go along the line of complete occupation of a significant territory, the creation of a Ukrainian state on it and the transition to a normal war with Moscow, while simultaneously waging a guerrilla struggle in other territories. Or the struggle can go on all the time only by revolutionary and guerrilla methods, without creating stable fronts, gradually undermining the enemy's possessions and taking over the territory, until its complete defeat, which will come under military strikes from the outside and, to no lesser extent, from internal paralysis - from the revolution.

Regardless of the form of the end of the struggle and the external situation, the attitude of outside forces, the Ukrainian national revolution, simultaneously with the elimination of the Bolshevik occupation, would immediately build a Ukrainian independent state on all the lands of Ukraine. If any forces stood in the way, or wanted to seize part of the Ukrainian

lands - to fight them with a spear. This danger is very possible, especially from Moscow.

The war of external forces against the USSR, regardless of their intentions, will create favourable situations for the full unfolding of the anti-Bolshevik liberation revolution. On the other hand, our revolutionary struggle is objectively useful for the enemies of the USSR and makes it much easier for them to wage war. But this mutual benefit can be of varying degrees. It will be the least if both sides treat themselves indifferently, trying only to use the consequences of the other side's actions for themselves. The greatest benefit for both sides will be when there is an allied attitude between them, coordination of the struggle according to an agreed plan, when the war of the enemies of the USSR and the liberation revolution of the enslaved peoples will be treated by both sides as one common cause, and the principle of cooperation and mutual assistance will be equally accepted and observed. Then the struggle against Bolshevism would be much easier, shorter, and would cost fewer victims.

But for such cooperation, the mere fact of fighting against the same enemy is not enough. An allied attitude can exist when there is a coherence of goals, so that neither side has goals in the struggle that are in opposition to the other, nor are such efforts thwarted by third factors. A further prerequisite is a coherent concept of war itself, at least in the aspect where the interests and actions of both sides coincide. And finally, the requirement of mutual interpretation as partners in a common cause, rather than an object of exploitation.

To reach this attitude, the policies of Western countries would have to undergo a major evolution. Today, it is still very far from such an attitude. First, because it does not yet have a fully decisive course towards Russia, and in the event of war, it does not yet have a crystallised concept along all lines. Secondly, it does not yet have a proper assessment of at least all the main factors of the great contest.

Perhaps many fundamental adjustments have to be made by the West in the midst of the war, when it will learn from painful experience that some of its current calculations are wrong. An incorrect assessment and erroneous attitude of the West to the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other peoples enslaved by Moscow will have a harmful effect on the integrity of the anti-Bolshevik world struggle, and it will not be useful to the

Western countries, and our cause. We would like to see this come to fruition in good time, and we must act in that direction. But in considering the attitude of external forces in our struggle, we must take into account the actual situation, not what should be or what we would like to see.

When comparing the contribution of the revolutionary struggle and the wars of the Western powers to the defeat of Bolshevik imperialism, it is easy to make a very big mistake when looking at quantitative data. In the war of the great powers, huge masses of people and material are involved, casualties in human terms number in the millions, and devastation devours the results of the labour of many generations. Because war from the outside strikes mainly at what the enemy puts up, what it hides behind, and it is difficult to reach him. The revolution works differently - it operates with fewer means, but it hits the neuralgic nodes from within, beating the real enemy. There is a large quantitative effect, but here it is a qualitative one.

The correct and only realistic concept of Ukraine's liberation is its own revolutionary struggle, also in the event of a near future world war. For only in this struggle can the Ukrainian people win their freedom and build their statehood. Only in the revolutionary struggle within the USSR can the whole nation take part, and only this form of our struggle can have a correspondingly great effect, which will overthrow Bolshevism, or will largely contribute to it and force external forces to take our struggle and its goals into account. Only through a national revolution will the Ukrainian people be able to take power into their own hands, build an independent state and establish their own order. This is equally important in all constellations, in every attitude of external forces to our cause.

There is such a contradiction in practice between the revolutionary concept of liberation and the reliance on liberation from the outside, when our struggle is joined to someone else's war, that liberation politics cannot pursue both paths simultaneously in an equal way. The revolution demands that all forces be directed to the native lands and, in general, to the sub-Bolshevik territories of revolutionary action. Its plan is to unfold this struggle, taking into account first and foremost the circumstances within the USSR, without regard to where the military fronts are. For each soldier, the general direction is as follows: to go to the partisans, or to act in the Soviet army, in the spirit of revolution, and not to try to be captured. The outflow of potentially revolutionary elements to the other side of the front through surrender

would reduce the number of cadres who would actively fight on the side of the revolution, and the Soviet army would be further segregated in such a way that the Bolshevik element would remain loyal to Bolshevism. Thus, the surrender of an element capable of revolutionary struggle not in the plan of the revolution and can be justified only in such conditions when a person really has no real opportunity to join the rebels, nor can he do anything useful for the revolution, but faces the alternative of either going to captivity or fighting for Bolshevism to the death.

If we rely on the liberation struggle from the outside, on the creation of a Ukrainian military force on the other side of the front, the surrender of Ukrainian soldiers is desirable in order to incorporate them into foreign military formations, obviously when there is a real opportunity for this. According to this plan, all forces capable of fighting would have to be concentrated and formed on the other side of the front and come to Ukraine together with the front of the Western allies, in accordance with their military plan.

The revolutionary struggle on the sub-Soviet side was to play only a supporting role.

The opposite is true in terms of revolution. Even all the forces that can be mobilised abroad must get to the Bolshevik backwater, to the Ukrainian lands, by all means and by all means, and there join the revolutionary, insurgent struggle. Everything that cannot and will remain on the Allied side is treated in the context of the liberation struggle as an action of secondary, only auxiliary or reserve importance.

Similarly, the way political and propaganda work is conducted abroad is quite different. The position of the Ukrainian factor in the international order depends on the concept that will form the basis of the liberation policy. For the Ukrainian liberation movement in its native lands and abroad, there is no hesitation or discussion in this matter. Our path to liberation is our own revolutionary struggle and the directing of all the forces that can be activated in it. This will be the path of Ukraine's modern liberation struggle, also in the event of a war between the West and the USSR. All actions abroad and from abroad must fit into this basic plan. Everything else can only play a minor role in the course of events.

The whole attempt to put Ukrainian liberation policy on a different track will remain a minor episode with no trace.

## **Friends - Ukrainian nationalists!**

*The news of the death in action against the Bolsheviks of the UPA Commander-in-Chief, Captain Taras Muprynka, conveyed to the OUN Central Committee by the lieutenants of the UVR caused not only great pain for the loss of the hero, but also doubts about its credibility. This was clearly expressed by C. Bandera in an article-appeal "Friends - Ukrainian nationalists!" (published under his signature in "Surma", part 24, October 1950) and in letters to the OUN leadership in foreign lands from 26 October and 15 November. 1950 p.*

*This article was reprinted under the title "Stepan Bandera's Letter to the Ukrainian Nationalists in the weekly Ukrainian Samostoynik, Munich, Year I, no. 43 of 5. 3. 1950 p.*

In this difficult, tragic moment, as I you the news of what has happened, I must share with you uncomfortable regrets, pain, and heavy thoughts and, together with you, seek to rise from the blackness of despair in one source of comfort - in faith in the strength of the people and in God's justice, which will lead to the victory of the great Truth of Ukraine, a victory bought with immeasurable sacrifices.

On 18 October this year, two people who acted as authorised representatives of the UHHR's Foreign Representation handed over to the representatives of the OUN Leadership of the OUN's Foreign Units, along with two other documents, a longer letter from a member of the OUN Leadership in the Ukrainian Lands. This letter contains the most painful news for each of us, for every Ukrainian patriot: 5 March 1950, the leader of the Ukrainian national liberation revolutionary movement in Ukraine, friend Tur (Tur was the pseudonym of Roman Shukhevych, as the Head of the OUN Leadership in Ukraine. On the life and work of R. Shukhevych, see Stefan Bandera's article in this collection "Commander - Leader (In the footsteps of Roman Shukhevych)", 1954).

This terrible news nailed us all with the indescribable. The heart sinks, the soul cannot accept it, does not want to believe . . .

No, it is impossible to believe, how can there be such a certainty that would destroy every tiny bit of hope that He is still living and fighting. I want to be sure, to check, and my soul is eagerly searching for anything that could deny the truth of the terrible news, or at least question it. On the fifth

March was supposed to be the date, and the last letter from Tours, with his own handwriting, was from the last days of February. A few days before the ominous fifth of March. The other more recent news, though very brief, says nothing about such a terrible blow. All they say is that the struggle in Ukraine is continuing, and the Krai has only itself to blame. Is it possible that the news did not contain such information?

Or perhaps other, earlier information has not reached us? There is a discrepancy, but no definite denial, only doubt. And the letter itself, in which this news is given, is it true?

And this is a question we cannot answer with any certainty on the basis of the data we have at our disposal. A multi-page typewritten letter signed by hand with the organisational name of a member of the OUN leadership in Ukraine. The content of the letter as a whole indicates that it was written by a member of the OUN leadership in Ukraine. It shows knowledge of the internal affairs of the revolutionary liberation movement, although there are some points of contradiction with what Tur had written earlier, but explanations can be found. There may be doubts as to whether this is not a rewrite of a genuine letter from the Leadership that could have fallen on the way. To be sure, we would need to rely on a detailed analysis of the entire mail, which is mentioned in the letter addressed to us and the materials involved, but which, for some unknown reason, we have not been entrusted with.

And the second and final requirement for clarification is a detailed check of the route by which the mail arrived. This is done on a case-by-case basis, without regard to the content of the mail or the identity of the messengers. Now the Organisation has no way of doing this. The materials we received came by a route unknown to us, and the senders refused to give any explanation. In such a case, it would be normal to consider the whole case dubious and to refrain from drawing conclusions until it has been verified in another, independent way, especially since it is possible to do so. This was the intention of the OUN Central Committee to wait. However, the transmitters of the documents from the region, acting as authorised representatives of the UHHR, stated that they were fully responsible for the authenticity of the documents and could not restrain the announcement of the news of Gen. Chuprynka's death, because earlier, before the documents were handed over to the Organisation, they had sent a message to the press and taken steps to ensure their wide publication. Indeed, the first information came from their source in the foreign press and in radio reports.

We also do not have any evidence that would exclude the veracity of the news of the death of the leader of the Tura-Czuprynka, only those that cast doubt on it. But in such a situation, when other factors have taken full responsibility for proclaiming this terrible news for the liberation cause and painful for every Ukrainian patriot, when they vouch for its veracity on the basis of their information, we, leaving aside our assessment of their actions, cannot but accept the news itself as true. For we cannot assume that any Ukrainian could disrespect such a tragic matter and proclaim the news of the death of General Chuprynka without having one hundred per cent certainty. We have to accept it as true, even though our whole soul, heart, and mind are against it.

Therefore, we accept that the creator, an unsurpassed artist of new methods of anti-Bolshevik revolutionary struggle, guerrilla strategy and tactics, and underground organisation has died; whom the entire NKVD-MIA-MTV system has been chasing, searching for, turning over houses, forests, and land in Ukraine for more than five years now, and all without success, because all the most refined methods, unlimited means, and the most violent forms of Bolshevik terror and provocation cannot overcome his courage, determination, and ingenuity.

It is difficult to accept the tragic news. Although everyone who knows the conditions in which the revolutionary struggle in Ukraine is taking place today, and the terrible, hellish forces our friends in Ukraine are fighting, the deepest part of their souls is always worried about who has fallen and who is still fighting. For five years, the whole world has been filled with fear of the great power of the USSR, of the hellish recklessness and cruel system of Bolshevism.

The most powerful states of the West sought some kind of harmony with Bolshevik Moscow, and the hydra of communist betrayal and corrupt capitulatory tendencies reared its head high among those nations.

And at the same time, from the last world war to the present day, untamed Ukraine has continued its desperate life-and-death struggle. The political and armed struggle of the OUN and UPA, with the active support and participation of the broadest segments of the Ukrainian people, has become for the whole world a fiery island in the sea of reconciliation with Bolshevism. Our struggle for truth and freedom, like a torch, throws light in the darkness for many nations. Bolshevik Moscow has already

For six years, it has been trying to destroy the revolutionary and liberation struggle in Ukraine by all means, using terrible, inhuman means. But to no avail. The OUN, UPA and UGVR, under the skilful leadership of their beloved Leader - Commander-in-Chief General Chuprynka, with full dedication to the support of the entire Ukrainian people, continued, expanded and improved their struggle.

The soul of an entire freedom-loving people turned with all its movements to listen to the voice of the one who stood directly at the head of the liberation struggle, led it on the underground front, and gave by himself, his life, work and struggle an unattainable example of a revolutionary fighter, Ukrainian nationalist, underground insurgent, leader, commander, and leader of the underground, revolutionary Government of Ukraine. All the most heartfelt feelings, best wishes, and hopes of the Ukrainian nation were associated with His name. The entire nation followed every step of His struggle with bated breath. But also a black shadow followed His every footstep - the enemy's fiercest efforts to track Him down, reach Him, catch Him, or at least kill Him.

We were all always aware of this, and our great anxiety never ceased, even though we were waiting with faith and hope for news from our homeland. And each time our news from Ukraine, which came to the Signal Service, occupied by the greatest labour, dedication and great sacrifices of the revolutionaries, brought along with good news a lot of very painful and mournful information. Each time we received information about more and more casualties, more and more lists, the number of friends who had fallen in the struggle, reports on the great victims of Bolshevik terror among the entire population, descriptions of more and more NKVD actions and more and more brutal methods of terror. However, our hearts were strengthened by the information that showed, in the language of concrete data, that nothing could break the spirit, zeal and fighting spirit of the entire liberation movement, of the entire warring nation.

The UPA and OUN always invented and implemented improved, successful countermeasures against enemy methods and actions, new fighters always took the place of the fallen, the cadres of revolutionaries at all levels were constantly replenished, the struggle grew stronger, and the masses, under the influence of its ideas and inspiring examples of heroism, despite the enemy's terror, supported it more and more devotedly and actively. The struggle

The Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement is becoming more and a struggle of the whole nation.

And this time, in a letter from a member of the OUN Leadership in the Ukrainian Lands from the end of July this year, it was also stated that despite this greatest loss, the liberation struggle did not break or falter. The enemy failed to decapitate the Ukrainian revolution. In the UGVR, in the UPA General Command, in the OUN Leadership in the Ukrainian Lands, other hands took the reins and are steering skilfully. Former closest assistants and deputies succeeded him in the positions he held. Who were hardened together with Ture, who learned everything, who created, organised and co-lead together, who under his leadership acquired high skills in the revolutionary struggle and took over from him everything that a leader can pass on to his closest collaborators and deputies, have taken his place and are making every effort to continue his great work with dignity. All the cadres of the liberation struggle in Ukraine, the ranks of nationalist revolutionaries, the UPA soldiers, and all Ukrainians close to the liberation movement did not falter even for a moment, even under the influence of such painful news, their zeal was even more firm, as their hardened hearts were petrified by the pain.

The revolutionary struggle continues unabated, and with even greater fervour, for the Spirit of Tura-Cuprynka will never lower its warriors for the freedom and truth of Ukraine. The blood of the Leader of the Tura has hardened the hearts of all the fighters in their desire for victory.

Our friends from Ukraine write to us about this, and we are confident in their steadfastness. And we, Ukrainian nationalists abroad, will not falter in our belief in our truth, in the certainty that our path of liberation struggle is the right one, that all the victims on it will not be in vain, but will lead to the victory of the righteous cause.

Our faith has not wavered, although the blood rushes out of our hearts at thought that the Greatest, the Best in our movement is no longer there.

But His great, strong spirit will forever remain among us, calling us to continue to fight even harder. None of us will stop at any sacrifice, just as He did not stop at giving His life for the freedom of His homeland. He gave us the best example that in the most difficult circumstances, in the most seemingly hopeless situation, it is possible and necessary to

to fight for the greater truth. His name is inextricably linked to the most heroic stage of Ukraine's revolutionary and liberation struggle, which will be the strongest foundation for its further expansion until the majestic victory of the Ukrainian National Revolution.

The realisation of the great idea, on whose altar the Ukrainian nation already sacrificed so many of its best sons and daughters and is still bringing more and more of them, will one day be the reward of God's justice. And the great legion of the most perfect examples of heroism and self-sacrifice for the cause will be deeply embedded in the nation's soul and will guide it in its further development for many centuries. In that legion of heroes, all those who gave their lives for the freedom of Ukraine, known and unknown knights of the holy cause, stand beside each other. The memory of the Tour Leader, Chief Commander Chuprynka, will forever symbolise the memory of all the fallen heroes of his stage!

Glory to the heroes!

## **Against the ideological disarmament of the liberation struggle**

*This article was published in the magazine "Surma", Munich, part 27 of January 1951, without , and had editorial subheadings: Revolution and . False calculations. The decisive factor. Fantasy and reality. Do we in the West not like revolutions? Chinese science... will not go into the forest!*

*The author develops a theme that he has already partially touched upon in his previous article "The Third World War and the Liberation Revolution", overturning the accusation nationalism is an obstacle to our liberation struggle.*

"In the West, they do not like nationalism, they do not like revolution, they do not like fanaticism. The unpopularity of our cause and many difficulties on the external front stem from the fact that the modern liberation struggle is organised and led by Ukrainian nationalists who have the brand of fanatics, and that this struggle is defined as a national revolutionary struggle, and the liberation concept as a national revolution. If we want to find a favourable attitude of the Western powers towards our cause, we must change all this. We should not speak of nationalism, of revolution, or emphasise the postulate of state sovereignty, but only give our struggle the character of resistance - the struggle against Bolshevism as a system of dictatorship and totalism, for a democratic state and social order. This should be done not only in everything that is intended for outsiders, but also in the ideology, the programme, the political concept, the tactics and methods, in the construction of the liberation movement, in the positioning and emphasis of the importance of individual constituent forces."

In this sense, and with this argumentation, there are constant attacks on the modern revolutionary and liberation movement abroad, carried out by various factors, Ukrainian and foreign, in various ways and means - from within and without, from subtle ideological penetration, to gross slander, provocation and direct pressure. Different factors have different goals. Some are motivated by the sincere belief that this kind of reshuffle would indeed be useful for the success of the liberation struggle. Others, with their own interests in mind

individuals or group interests, believe that a reshuffle in the liberation movement will allow them to take leading positions. There is also no shortage of outside attempts to take control of the Ukrainian liberation movement, to influence its direction and actions, to make it an instrument of their own politics, instead of dealing with an independent, sovereignly acting dynamic factor.

Along the same lines, there is also one branch of another corrosive action aimed at disrupting and undermining the united and combat-ready Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism.

Here we will not go into a closer examination of these different directions, but will only consider the very content of the trend presented at the beginning, as it can be put forward by people of good will and pure intentions who have only the cause of Ukraine's liberation in mind and who are guided by their understanding of the problem, and not by other motives. Such tendencies are based on the desire to link the cause of Ukraine's liberation to the policies of Western states and to judge them from different perspectives. There is only one page in the current international order and its future outcome - the opposition and play of two power complexes, the dynamics and potential of which are assessed only by physical and material measures. The ideological page of the world competition is treated as a side, additional dimension, not as an essential factor. It is underestimated that the competition of opposing socio-political ideas on a global scale will also decide the overall outcome, as it determines the place and role of many forces on one side or the other, affects the dynamics of individual components of the forces, the cohesion and coordination of the opposing power camps.

If we take into account the potential of Western states, measured by the numerical data of its various components - population, raw material resources, the state of industry and the ability to increase its potential, the mobilisation of naval, air and land forces, etc. - we can draw erroneous conclusions. The same erroneous conclusion can be drawn from comparing the figures of the military potential of the Western and Soviet blocs in their statistical form. We need to look at how much, in what direction and with what dynamics the Western powers are using their forces and resources to counter the Bolshevik offensive. In such a consideration

We will see that in terms of action, and most importantly in politics, in ideological and political opposition, the effective weight of the potential of the Western powers was not properly used.

To illustrate this, let us point out some points. The vicious opposition between the USSR and the so-called capitalist world, i.e. the Western powers, and the inevitability of a total between them over whether to be or not to be, is a constant factor in contemporary international life, which existed long before the last world war, as well as during the war and after its end. Nothing has changed in this regard, for the Bolsheviks, despite their military alliance with the Western powers, and with all the tactical changes in their policy, sufficiently manifested this general line and the guideline of their entire internal development.

The Western nations were also well aware of this, even before their alliance with the USSR in the Second World War. During the war with Hitler's Germany, the USSR had a knife to its throat, and the Bolsheviks needed the help and alliance of the Western powers more than these powers needed theirs, the Bolsheviks'. Nevertheless, the Bolsheviks did not make a fundamental reshuffle within themselves, did not renounce the rivalisation and reprisals against their Western allies of the time, and did not demobilise anti-Allied sentiment. On the contrary, for all the threats and difficulties of the war with Germany, the policy and strategy of the USSR consistently adhered to the line that immediately after the end of the war with Germany, a period of rivalry, conflict and general reprisals with the Western allies should follow, and the Bolsheviks always prepared for this and took the most favourable positions.

This had to be seen and understood by the ruling political factors of the Western powers. If they concealed this reality from their peoples, directed their societies to the opposite - to a long peaceful coexistence with the USSR - and developed their entire policy in such an unrealistic direction, then the reasons for this cannot be sought in ignorance.

In the immediate aftermath of the fall of Germany, the power relationship between the USSR and the Western powers was, under any review, more useful to the latter than ever before. This is something that the Western powers did not try and failed to use in any way to reach

any actual, lasting solution in order to establish at least favourable circumstances for themselves. On the contrary, they unnecessarily gave the Bolsheviks the main benefits of military victory, sacrificed new peoples to them, gave them useful vantage points, put them in a responsible position in international life, and demobilised them under every scrutiny. And all this in order to immediately have to move on to the most useless and humiliating games with yesterday's ally, spending a lot of money, a lot of energy and facing failure.

Or the case of nuclear energy and the bomb. We know what a paramount position this invention occupied in the American and Western confidence in their material superiority over the USSR. Now, despite all the cover-ups, the world is learning about more and more cases of the creators-inventors who, like ordinary traitors, passed on the secret to the Bolshevik enemy.

We have mentioned these facts in order to demonstrate the truth that the effective effect of the existing forces and the whole potential depends on the ideological, moral and political attitudes of the whole peoples who possess them, and in particular their ruling political circles. From these considerations, we conclude that one cannot look only at the material and physical strength a state or group of states, but at the same time, or rather even above all, one must look at their ideological attitude and policy direction, because if these dislocating factors are not in order, then the power is useless.

We fundamentally disagree with such an attitude towards Ukrainian liberation politics that seeks the most powerful forces opposed to Bolshevism, and wants to put the fate of our liberation in their hands, regardless of whether they are really positive and serious about our cause and whether the association with these forces is not a matter of unprincipled opportunism. The criterion of strength itself is not enough. Neither the fact that a powerful state is an active or potential opponent of Bolshevism.

The decisive question must be how it treats our liberation struggle and the cause of Ukraine's state independence. Only a positive and serious attitude provides the basis for linking our struggle with the anti-Bolshevik activities of such a state.

In the policy of the leading Western powers up to that time, even with its strong anti-Bolshevik emphasis, there were no signs of a positive attitude towards the liberation of Ukraine. In such a situation, the policy of hitching to their wagon is not a liberation policy, nor does it have any appearance of leading to liberation. Therefore, it would be quite unnecessary to argue that we need to adjust our ideological and political-conceptual positions to the taste of the current course of policy of the Western powers simply because they are the greatest force opposed to Bolshevism.

We could take more seriously such arguments for revising our ideological and political positions, which would arise in the wake of confrontation with the respective positions of the Western powers and which would prove that they are better, more worthwhile, or more suitable and successful in the struggle against Bolshevism. (If such arguments were sustainable!).

It is worth taking a closer look at who in the West dislikes nationalism and revolution and what they oppose. Here, we can only throw a few glimpses of light on these issues.

"In the West, every nationalism is treated in the same way. They identify national nationalism with chauvinism, with totalitarianism, with dictatorship, with national intolerance, exclusivity, and consider it to be the cause of international conflicts. All nationalism is compromised by Hitlerism..." - Arguments like this and others like it are found at every turn. But all of them are frivolous because they mistake the effect for the cause.

It is true that such views are being spread in the West by all means of propaganda and public opinion. But the ruling political circles that do this are confused about the actual situation. They know that Hitlerism is already dead, that knee-jerk nationalism is inherently different, that dictatorship, totalitarianism, intolerance

- These are signs of imperialism, which Hitlerism was and which Bolshevism is in the highest degree. They know that the cause of enmity between peoples and the obstacles to peaceful, harmonious coexistence between them are mainly the imperialist tendencies of some peoples to enslave and exploit other peoples and to impose their own systems on them,

They are well aware that liberation nationalisms are now entering the historical arena, opposing all imperialist efforts, wanting freedom and sovereignty for their peoples and recognising the same rights for other nations, respecting them and striving for peaceful coexistence and free exchange of spiritual and material resources among free nations on the basis of mutual respect for sovereignty and vital rights and needs.

The real reason for the organised global attack on nationalisms, in particular liberation nationalisms, is an attempt to pave the way for imperialisms, overt and covert, political and economic. The instigators of this want to divert attention from their imperialist attempts, to blame nationalism for everything and to destroy it for resisting them.

What will they oppose to nationalism?

Internationalism, various kinds of levelling of national, political, cultural and economic distinctions. All this is supposedly for the sake of equalisation between peoples, but in reality it is for the simpler and easier supremacy of stronger, larger nations over smaller and weaker ones.

The main cause and organiser of the anti-nationalist movement was and is the largest invasive imperialism - Russian Bolshevism, which carries out its work not only directly, but also indirectly, through its various agencies and other people's actions inspired by it. Other participants join in, whether in an attempt to find common ground and understanding with Bolshevism, or for their own reasons and purposes, dealing with nationalisms as an obstacle to their penetration among foreign peoples.

To illustrate these general statements, it is enough to recall the story of the international boycott of Spain. Who can believe that Spain and the Franco government were put outside the framework of international life for their dictatorship and mono-party or totalitarian system, while the worst dictatorship and totalitarianism of the USSR and its satellites is not on the index, on the contrary, it is one of the first places in the ON system? It is obvious to everyone that the boycott of Spain is a matter of Bolshevik Moscow's doing and achievement. Despite this clarity, this situation continues to this day, as if in mockery.

Although the Bolsheviks are the greatest enemies of every nationalism except Russian, they are well aware of the power of the national idea and that it is the main driver of the most powerful historical shifts. Therefore, they directly fight only those nationalist movements that are their enemies. Instead, outside of its sphere of domination, Bolshevism tries to harness and exploit the liberation nationalist aspirations of colonial and semi-colonial peoples under the rule of Western powers. In relation to them, the Bolsheviks act as protectors, spokesmen for national liberation struggles and nationalist aspirations for sovereignty.

In contrast, the policies of the Western powers lack the capacity for such duality. Once they have taken a course against nationalism for their own reasons, or on Bolshevik impulses, their policies are negative towards all nationalism. But this has little to do with the political demands of the peoples concerned, and more to do with reasons that were put forward by the Bolsheviks and are contrary to the real needs of those peoples.

If the West does not like revolutions as a factor in historical processes, it is probably not for principled reasons. After all, the leading Western nations have not only experienced revolutions themselves, but also put them on a high pedestal in their history. The national revolution is the birth of the village, which only through it became a state, not a colony. Today's France derives its republicanism from a revolution; England also owes its democracy to a revolution.

If they can put a high value on internal revolution as a process of state and social upheaval, then how much higher should be the value of national liberation revolution as a process of liberation of a nation from foreign domination and slavery.

Similarly, revolutions cannot be denied from a humanitarian perspective as a form of the ultimate struggle for freedom. Revolution is a process and a form of struggle with the least possible sacrifice. It strikes at the very essence, at the essential causes and defenders of the condition it is fighting, not at its victims, the forced instruments. Compared to war, especially with the latest means and methods of mass extermination of people and animals, revolution is the most humane form of struggle. Everyone knows this.

The reluctance among Western nations to support the revolutionary struggles of other nations stems from the fact that they are fed and content, and would like the world to be free of

There have been no major changes that could lead to a reshuffling of the international order. They are happy with the way things are, and they don't want to know that other nations are in an unbearable situation, fighting for their rights and free life, that new nations, long ago put under ice, are coming onto the world stage.

Every news of any revolutionary liberation processes is even more disturbing for those states that keep other peoples in colonial dependence, and which fear their impulses to live independently, fear every such example. Only this reluctance cannot be attributed to the very definition or form of revolution, because this reluctance is related to the very essence of it - the struggle of an enslaved people for independence. And whoever for these reasons does not want to hear about the Ukrainian national revolution will be equally reluctant to take note the liberation struggle of Ukraine, in whatever form and under whatever name.

If we are disliked for our so-called fanaticism, it means that we are disliked for our unwavering, uncompromising struggle against bigotry and enslavement. In the end, this is less relevant now, but stems from previous years, when our revolutionary struggle was not in harmony with the policies of Western powers - the Bolsheviks' increasingly more concessions, the search for coexistence with the USSR and the closing of eyes to their crimes. The attitude of the Ukrainian national movement is indeed a dissonance to the message of Western politics, namely that we know only one attitude to an invader, enslaver and destroyer of entire nations and all freedom - an uncompromising struggle against it.

Instead, there was a quietly recognised rule in the West's previous policy that even criminals like the Bolsheviks could share the world, trade and live in good terms, as long as they limited their criminal practices to the nations they had already conquered and did not move further, threaten or infringe on the vital interests of their Western partners. As we know, Moscow does not adhere to this, and the West is moving to other policy tracks and other principles of "practical morality". Next, the West will become a fanatical opponent of Bolshevism, because it has begun to reach Western pantries.

We have already mentioned that the ideological and political principles that until recently guided the Western powers in their attitude to

to Bolshevik imperialism, in practice proved to be unsuitable, bringing far worse results than what those states could have achieved through the more appropriate use of their capabilities and positions and through the correct discharge of the historical responsibility that fell to them. For our purposes, it is even more important to understand the consequences of the ideological and political influence of the Western great powers among those nations that followed them, falling under Bolshevik domination, and to stand up to the Bolshevik threat.

There is no need to highlight the harmful consequences in Central Europe of the post-war policy of the West against the USSR, its reliance on democratisation of the Bolshevik system, on its penetration with democratic content and on its internal transformation under the pressure of peaceful means, and on pushing the political thought and action of the leading circles of the so-called satellite countries, i.e. the peoples who came under the rule of the USSR as a result of the war, to this path.

Following these Western influences, the political action of resistance to Bolshevisation took completely wrong paths and used inappropriate methods. Instead of immediately embarking on the path of revolutionary methods of action and a revolutionary system of political organisation, the leading circles chose to combine collaboration with parochial methods of opposition. The outcome is known - the Bolsheviks dealt with those who played against their system; having lost their bet, the political asset was partly eliminated, partly fled, and the people were left disoriented, helpless, their energy was lost, and passivity remained.

The example of China is even more instructive. The defeat and internal breakdown of China's national forces in the fight against the communist offensive probably has many reasons. As a consequence of the USSR's unnecessary and undeserved acceptance of the role of co-victor over Japan and the huge spoils of war in Manchuria, the Communist forces in China received very large amounts of reinforcements and equipment. At that time, the national forces, exhausted by the long war on two fronts, received from America far too little help in supplies, such that they could neither live nor die with it. However, it was not only the material factor that hindered the outcome.

It is well known that national China underwent a process of major internal disintegration, so that the important military forces, instead of fighting, went over to the side of the enemy, along with the supplies received from abroad. We do not have sufficiently definite information the nature of this disintegration, its causes and background.

But we have to accept that the inadequate ideological guidance, the social system that was not suited to the needs of the nation, and the unhealthy state of the state system created by Kuomintang's ideological fall were largely to blame. The Americans point to this as the reason for the breakdown and futility of further support for Chiang Kai-shek on land. They argue that their influences and efforts in China were along the lines of reconciliation.

It is possible that this was partly the case with regard to the rehabilitation of the state, administrative, economic and military machinery. We know that in the first post-war years, various missions led by political and military figures of the first order were very active in China. Did they really help and care for the strengthening of national forces? Many reports of the time make it clear that American policy, the work and influence of their missions followed a general line of bringing together national Chinese factors with communist ones, creating a joint government, one army, etc. Not only persuasion and mediation were used in this direction, but also pressure through the appropriate "regulation" of deliveries.

We are convinced that such constant attempts to reach a compromise are most successful in spreading demobilisation and disintegration among the people who are at war and among the army at war. One hand was helping, and the other was making things even worse. Perhaps the Americans owe most of all to their policy of reconciling everyone with the Bolsheviks that their sons in Korea are being shot at by weapons once intended for the Chinese national forces.

With these clarifications, we wanted to clearly prove our assertion that the ideological and political principles and methods used by the Western powers against the Bolsheviks, in their own policies and in the concepts they imparted to other peoples, in fact wrong, and were detrimental to the defence of the world against the Bolshevik invasion. After this, it is no longer necessary to overturn the suggestion that the revolutionary liberation movement should

to change their ideological and political positions and adjust them to the concept of the West.

The ideas of the modern liberation movement of Ukraine are the ideas of Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism, and the modern liberation struggle is the implementation of its political concept. Our positions have withstood the toughest test of life that a revolutionary movement can undergo. Our ideas are our greatest strength, the most successful weapon with which we will defeat Bolshevism. No soldier exchanges his tried-and-tested weapon for one that he knows has malfunctioned many times and proved useless in battle, even though it is provided for parade.

On the contrary, we are convinced that the Western world, faced with the inevitable finality of raising the struggle against Bolshevism or face its demise, will, at the moment of the turning point, throw out of its political arsenal everything that has tied its hands with Bolshevik imperialism and caused great harm. Then the nature of Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism and its liberation struggle will be understood and perceived in a completely different way. Because then the West will adopt an uncompromising, anti-Bolshevik style and accept ideas that can defeat Bolshevism. And everything that has so far aided Bolshevism, paved the way for it, or sought compromises with it, will go overboard, or at least hide in the shadows. Without such an internal fracture, a realignment, the West would have been doomed to perish. The atomic bomb will not save it, after all, the rats have already carried its secret to Moscow.

Meanwhile, the Ukrainian revolution is following its own path and is not thinking of straying from , nor of laying down its arms, including its strongest weapon - its ideas; the enemy has not snatched them from us and will not snatch them from us; he has not succeeded in desecrating them, and no one will succeed in taking them away by trickery or deceptive bargaining.

## **Propaganda of the liberation revolution against the backdrop of war**

*Following the constant tension between the CCCR and the West, which at the time threatened the prospect of a third world war, the author of this article will once again return to the theme he elucidated in his article "The Third World War and the Liberation Struggle". In his opinion, the process of increasing the possibility of a war breaking out should be used to neutralise the impact of the sub-Soviet reality on the population of the enslaved countries, to encourage resistance and to shatter the myth of the alleged omnipotence of the Bolshevik regime.*

*Unsigned article published in the magazine "Surma", Munich, . 29, March 1971.*

The constant aggravation of the conflict between the USSR and the Western powers and the real possibility of a new world war are of great importance for the development of the revolutionary process in the sub-Bolshevik countries. With the war clearly brewing and preparations for it intensified, and even more so during the war, Bolshevik oppression, terror, want and other such phenomena grow inordinately causing the anti-Bolshevik attitudes of the masses to grow. The cause of the war occupies a central place in the political thinking of the post-Soviet man, and is ingrained in his daily life already at a distant preparatory stage. This is not a passing mood, not a psyche, but a reality felt from the entire Bolshevik action, which is also clearly reflected in the world political situation.

The vast masses of the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism are waiting for war, despite all the fear, sacrifice, patience and devastation it brings. It is already hanging over the peoples as an inevitable future, as a result of the unquenchable drive of Russian imperialism for further conquests, for the conquest of the whole world. The peoples of the sub-Bolshevik world link their hopes for the decline of Bolshevism and liberation to the war.

This is useful for the development of the liberation revolution insofar as it maintains irreconcilability with Bolshevism, with enslavement, and nourishes the belief that its fall is inevitable and imminent. Such hopes reinforce a person's inner rebellion against reality, against the regime, and prevent the belief that the existing state

unshakable, counteracting despondency, resignation, and the urge to constantly submit to Bolshevism.

The Bolsheviks understand this very well and fear such consequences of encouraging the masses to go to war. This leads to a ridiculous contradiction in Bolshevik domestic policy and propaganda. Lately, on the one hand, there have been huge armaments and demonstrations of military power, terrible cries about the fictitious incitement to war by the Western powers, about the preparation of a great, terrible war machine in the West, aimed at aggression against "people's democracies", and on the other hand, the introduction of terrorist laws against the spread of warlike sentiments in all communist countries. It is clear that the new wave of mass terror under the guise of peacefulness is directed not against the material and psychological preparations for war being made by the Bolshevik regime itself, but against the anti-Bolshevik sentiments and hopes of the masses, which are linked to the expectation of war.

The expectation of an imminent war between the USSR and the Western powers is a real, spontaneously acting factor that can successfully counteract the overwhelming suggestion of the entire sub-Bolshevik reality that the Bolshevik regime and system are inviolable and that the Russian Empire is invincible. The propaganda of the liberation revolution must properly assess the quality and strength of this factor in order to mobilise it and direct it into the mainstream of active struggle. The effects of systematic Bolshevik terror and propaganda in creating among the broad masses of the people the conviction that no one and nothing can destroy Bolshevism and Russian imperialism, that every attempt and every futile sacrifice is harmful, that the only thing left is to accept the disaster, to passively adapt in order to live somehow. This Bolshevik-infused suggestion and the general attitude it created is the greatest obstacle to the liberation revolution, freezing and paralysing the enormous revolutionary potential that is the deep and very strong hatred of the peoples oppressed by Bolshevism for the existing state, the desire to destroy and change it.

First of all, it is necessary to destroy the stone wall through which it is difficult for the great truth about the power of the people's revolution to penetrate the minds, consciousness and will of the of the former Soviet Union. If all those masses

If the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism, who hate it and want it to fall, but obey it and make enormous sacrifices, realised their power for a moment, stopped putting their hands to their own oppression under the orders of a hostile regime, and unanimously struck at their tyrant, there would be no trace of him.

Bringing this to the consciousness of the entire Ukrainian people and its natural allies is the first fundamental task of revolutionary action. This is the direction of the OUN-UPA's struggle on Ukrainian lands.

In this, our inherent goal is to make the peoples aware of their own potentiality, the possibility of gaining freedom through their own struggle in a revolutionary breakthrough, regardless of the world situation, without the help of outside forces, following the call of the core of the revolution and its people - the nationalist underground. But we must also make appropriate use of everything that successfully hits the wall of the belief that Bolshevism is invincible, in particular where it is most difficult to break it with the revolution's own arguments. Many people who will never believe in the revolution's ability to prevail have easier access to the idea of Bolshevism's fall in its military confrontation with Western powers. For those who have already succumbed to the suggestions of Bolshevik propaganda about the inexhaustible means, and above all about the unattainable technical power of the USSR, the most convincing arguments of the same order are the USSR's clash with the even larger, stronger, and above all qualitatively much higher technical and military potential of the Western bloc. Along with the spread of the belief that such a total war was inevitable in the near future, the belief in the failure of Bolshevism was also instilled in environments where revolutionary propaganda had not yet reached, or where there was no favourable ground for it. The hopes of the masses for war are like a battering ram against the wall of beliefs about the invincibility of Bolshevism. It is necessary to master this machine as well and break out the holes so that the message of the liberation revolution - revolutionary ideas, cries, faith and fervour for struggle - can break through.

Linking all the hopes of the masses for the destruction of Bolshevism to the war is detrimental to the revolution, as it increases the orientation towards external forces, instead of relying on their own struggle. Therefore, the efforts of revolutionary political and propaganda work must

should be aimed at transforming this military orientation into a revolutionary orientation, and passive waiting into active struggle. The expectation of war should not be opposed to the revolutionary concept of liberation, because the moods caused by such expectations would remain unused for the cause of the revolution or even partially directed against it. And they can be a very strong, spontaneous factor. On the contrary, these moods and hopes of the masses in connection with the war should be used as a basis for the revolution itself, linking one process to the other.

The revolutionary concept of liberation in the situation of a plausible outbreak of war is formalised in a nuclear programme-slogan that is spread among the masses of all the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism: during the war, without waiting for its end, the enslaved peoples rise up in a common liberation, anti-Bolshevik revolution. Revolution is the end of Bolshevism and the end of its war. This is freedom and peace!

The general anti-Bolshevik uprising should be launched by organised revolutionary, underground forces, the OUN-UPA and organisations of other nations, as well as revolutionised army units and workers' centres. The broad masses of the people, mobilised in the army and non-mobilised, at the front and in the rear, will join the struggle.

The decisive factor in revolutionary disruption is its massive scale and expansive spread from the foci of explosion to all sub-Bolshevik spaces, to all spheres of life. It is not a case of closing the revolutionary process in bastions and not a case of a small front war against the forces that the Bolsheviks still hold in their hands and throw to crush the disruption.

All efforts must be made to ensure that the revolutionary breakdown spreads like wildfire, that it is not allowed to localise, that it causes the entire state and military machine of the Bolshevik regime to spiral and seize it by the throat. In every place, in every sector, the Bolshevik regime had its own mouthpieces.

The entire action of the underground revolutionary forces, political-propaganda and guerrilla-combat in the first stage, is focused on spreading this concept-plan of the liberation revolution everywhere, so that its calls reach every corner, every person, so that they are understandable and impulsive, and so that through political and military manifestations of the underground's actions, create among the masses the consciousness that the existing leading, initiating and organising forces of the revolution are ready, and thus raise faith

in the cause of the revolution and readiness to participate in it.

These consequences of the preparatory struggle of the underground, combined with the general hatred of Bolshevism, will create explosive material that, at the appropriate time, will ignite and destroy the Bolshevik tyranny, break the back of the enslaving Russian imperialist language.

The propaganda of the revolution, in its broadest sense, with all the means and methods of spreading and establishing the ideas and plan of the revolution in Ukraine and among other peoples, is crucial to the whole struggle. It must prepare the people and each individual for the struggle, create such guidance that the initiatives, organising actions, calls and instructions from the revolutionary underground will then find not only sympathy but also implementation among the masses.

In spreading and substantiating our cries and transforming the passive expectation of freedom from war into a readiness for active struggle, revolutionary propaganda makes full use of the lessons of the last war, which are deeply imprinted in the minds of the masses. When Hitler's Germany was already defeated and the masses were still in the army and had weapons in their hands, it was the right time for them to actively engage in the struggle that the UPA was waging. Instead.

- The laying down of arms, the turning to the hated yoke and terrible poverty further worsens the regime they are fighting. A false delusion in the hope of some kind of correction through the evolution of the Bolshevik system. Is this to happen again?

War itself, without regard to its consequences, will never bring liberation.

Foreign powers waging war are fighting for their own goals, for their own good, not for the will of other peoples, including those who, though enslaved, stood in the Soviet ranks. In the absence of an active anti-Bolshevik struggle, one cannot hope for a friendly attitude from the victors from outside.

Moreover, then the victory over Bolshevism would have been much more difficult and later. War only creates a good opportunity and good possibilities for liberation through one's own struggle.

The anti-Bolshevik, liberation revolution during the war is the destruction of enemy captivity, the communist system of oppression, the creation and defence of the basis for national, social and personal freedom and well-being, the provision of freedom and unrestrained development

nations in independent states - at the cost of the least possible sacrifice. It immediately interrupts and ends the war, saves the lives of millions more soldiers and who are being persecuted for military slaughter, saves families, and protects homes, cities, and entire countries from the further terrible devastation of the modern nuclear war. The revolution, under greedy conditions, does not require even a fraction of the victims that war devours. And those who fall will give their lives for a good cause, for freedom, and will gain eternal glory among their peoples and the gratitude of many generations. If the broadest masses, military and civilian, conscious of the just cause of the people, actively stand by the revolution, then Bolshevism will be defended only by the worst enemies of the freedom of nations and people - communist and NKVD criminals and the most fierce defenders of Russian imperialism.

The general revolutionary breakdown cannot be postponed until the end of the war. Every delay is a prolongation of the war with its terrible victims and devastation. Many times, a few days of war would be enough to balance all the sacrifices that will have to be made to pay for the victory of the revolution. Waiting for the war to end may be too late. Every extension of the war means a deterioration in the conditions for peace. It is also wrong to wait for setbacks, crises and breakdowns in Bolshevik strategy. Because the exhaustion of the Bolshevik war machine in the course of the war itself means hectatoms of victims, the terrible impact of the blood of their own peoples, and the devastation of the country.

The enemies of the USSR could have planned a strategy of long attrition and delayed decisive campaigns, which would have brought about clear crises in Bolshevik warfare. But the most important thing in this matter is the Bolsheviks' failure to sort and use human material in war. They will certainly not sweep away the qualities of all military units in terms of loyalty to the regime. On the contrary, in addition to such units with a mixed element, which will be the most numerous, they will create sorted military units along two opposite lines. In some units, the most reliable element, tested in its loyalty to the regime, will be gathered - these will be primarily NKVD troops. They will be spared, assigned the role of not fighting the enemy so much as taming, keeping in check and under the supervision of the army and the backwoods. Such units will rarely go to the front, remaining an iron reserve for

the worst time. So, those elements will be the most spared in the war.

Instead, other, specially selected units will be sent to the slaughter, in the worst situations, in the first fire, wherever dams need to be dammed with corpses, and will be used to gather the most dangerous elements for Bolshevism, such as punitive battalions. Obviously, this distribution will be based mainly on the principle of nationality and territoriality, but also on a special sorting by individual cognition. In this way, the Bolsheviks can plan to ensure that all the first and greatest victims will be the peoples enslaved by Moscow, especially Ukrainians, and especially those who can turn their weapons against the Bolsheviks. Russians and especially communist elements will be spared.

In the same vein, all military burdens will be decomposed, territories will be interpreted in military operations, etc., so that the war will exhaust and exterminate first and foremost the peoples most hostile to Russian-Bolshevik imperialism, including Ukraine. Therefore, the idea that the revolutionary potential would increase as the war continued is wrong. It is true that the war will increasingly turn the passive and submissive into those ready to fight the executioners. But the process of extermination of all potential opponents of the regime, tainted by the Bolsheviks, will lead to a terrible bloodbath of the most valuable forces.

As to the question of at what stage of the war it is most appropriate to raise a revolutionary uprising, we must tell ourselves that we cannot postpone it for too long, in any case not until the very end of the war. We cannot count on Bolshevik failures and breakdowns; they be decisive. The most important thing is the psychological preparation of the masses for the revolution, and the fact that they will get their hands on weapons. And the state of war itself creates many more useful situations for revolution than peacetime.

Preparing for a general anti-Bolshevik disruption during the war means, first of all, broad revolutionary propaganda, which should instruct the masses and each individual accordingly. Everyone must know that during the war the anti-Bolshevik revolution will come, which will bring liberation, and they must join the fight in it where

will be in the time of disruption and in the way it is possible. It is being conducted all the time, right now, with the greatest effort, using different methods and in different forms. It is important that it reaches everywhere. At the same time, it cannot be hidden from the Bolsheviks, and there is no such plan. They must know about its existence, its content, and its intentions. We do not imagine or plan a revolution in the form of a completely secretive assassination attempt that arises unexpectedly, seizes some key positions and centres, immediately paralyses the enemy system, or spreads further under the influence of the first unexpected blow and sweep. We consider such plans for the preparation of a revolution to be unrealisable fantasies in anti-Bolshevik reality. If such a case were to be truly unknown, undisclosed during the preparations, then there would have to be a very small group of participants. This means that it could have been a single act, not a massive, preparatory action. An isolated act, whatever its content and whatever centre of the Bolshevik system it threatened, would not cause a general revolution, but would remain an episode, albeit a very significant one.

The main bet of the liberation revolution must be mass, preparing and then raising the masses to fight. The content of the preparatory propaganda must be publicly known, the organisational and technical conduct must be kept secret to some extent, and the leading and executing forces must be as numerous as possible so that the enemy paralyse them. The strength and security of revolutionary preparation lies in the masses. Because its inherent essence is the consciousness, inner conviction and guidance of each person, hidden in his or her soul.

The ideal way to conduct it is for everyone to know, for everyone to be on the lookout, silently and unnoticed. The wider such propaganda is deployed, the harder it is for the enemy to fight it, and then it spreads on its own, even from Bolshevik opposition. As a result of the widespread spread of revolutionary cries among the anti-Bolshevik peoples, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the regime to draw a line between the dangerous and the harmless. Its distrust and fear are growing. In a war situation, this creates a special atmosphere of generalised tension between the masses of soldiers and the communist activists in the army. There are fewer and fewer elements in which the regime has confidence. And it is difficult for the Bolsheviks to completely and openly switch to a division based on nationality - that a Muscovite and a Ukrainian of a certain nationality are "enemies of the people" - because this has bad consequences for the whole

their policy on the national question, which would play a very important role during the war. The Bolsheviks are increasingly entangled in contradictions that will undermine their positions one by one. All this is useful for the development of a revolution that has truth, clear ideas and a way of struggle behind it.

War invariably increases the patience, sacrifices and destruction of the peoples enslaved by Bolshevism. During the war, tens of millions of people face the threat of a certain kind of redemption. And this is all for the benefit, for the defence of the most terrible slavery, oppression. On the other hand, the war, from various perspectives, creates fertile opportunities, occasions for the anti-Bolshevik revolution, which will give freedom to the peoples, a new free life to man. It will simultaneously put an end to the war itself and Bolshevik tyranny.

Such oppositions, the finitude of the choice between two opposing dogmas that every nation and every individual faces during war, are the main material for revolutionary propaganda. Its task is to truthfully and convincingly reveal the two alternative dogmas to everyone, so that everyone chooses the path of struggle for truth and freedom, the path of the active fighter, and not the passive path to the Bolshevik meat grinder. Revolutionary propaganda must not only provide clear knowledge and a sober understanding of the situation and the way out of it. It must create a high intensity of will and feeling in each individual and in the masses, so that they can engage in the liberation struggle with determination and fervour.

## **Tasks of the OUN in the modern era. The OUN's tasks in Ukraine**

*This article is the material that St. Bandera prepared for the third Conference of OUN General Staff, which took place in April 1951. Of those materials, only one was published ("Surma", part ZO, April 1951), namely the tasks of OUN members in Ukraine and members in foreign countries, and the other two subsections: "Territorial Specifics" and "Separate Tasks in the Event of War" were omitted by the editors of the journal due to their conspiratorial content. It is possible that the finished work of C. Bandera's finished work included some additions or changes by other members of the then Leadership of the OUN, such as St. Lenkavsky, J. Stetsko and others.*

*The subsection "Our Tasks Abroad" was not the work of St. Bandera.*

The OUN created the backbone of the liberation struggle as the leading political force that created the UPA and the UGVR, and which remains the leading force today.

The OUN aims to prepare an armed uprising in Ukraine and help organise it, coordinating it with the liberation organisations of other peoples enslaved by Moscow throughout the former Soviet . The weapon of national liberation is the army, so all our current activities are aimed preparing it, that is, arming the people Armed breakthrough is the zenith of the struggle in all spheres of life that serve it.

The national revolution is identical to the national liberation war against the horseman, the national enemy. Therefore, it is good to keep in mind the term "war" when talking about national revolution.

Social revolutions are symbolised by barricades, national revolutions by divisions.

For a successful national revolution in Ukraine and in all post-Soviet countries, the most important thing is to develop a task-oriented, purposeful, disciplined, fanatical cadre of political leaders and revolutionary organisers. The hope automaticity, companionship, or tailspin of the revolution is the greatest threat to it. A political command organisation must be a monolith that knows what it wants and agrees with each other not only on the negative but also on the positive image of the future. A political organisation in Ukraine cannot create a conglomerate of different

elements, cannot be a French-style resistance, where various elements were united by a negative idea and grabbed themselves by the throat immediately after the war.

However, in order to attract all those who want to fight, a wider ring is needed around the monolithic core of the OUN. The UGVR, its platform, provides the basis for such a ring. However, the initiative must always be taken by an organisation that does not raise any problem half-heartedly, or in a coordinated but categorical manner.

The UGVR is a necessary completion for the integrity of the struggle, and in particular for the armed force, the UPA, which must encompass all the multifaceted elements from the popular strata. It is possible to march with the widest possible popular ranks when there is a nucleus in this element that will never go astray. These are two interdependent things: involving the widest possible circles in the struggle and building a purposeful and disciplined organised core among them.

The engine for the spread of the revolutionary army will continue to be the political organisation, which will also form the backbone of the revolutionary army, which has always been and will always be a political army. Especially at the time of the fall of Bolshevism, when a number of new enemy fifth columns will be created by Russia and other enemies of Ukraine, it is necessary to consolidate this political army.

A prerequisite for armed disruption is ideological and political re-education and today's connection with the direct struggle of the people's strata in all spheres of life: social, cultural, economic, church, etc.

Ukrainian ideas and concepts of individual parts of life, the consolidation of organic specific internal values, opposition to spontaneous attempts to establish their own organisation of individual areas of life, for example, support for the struggle for private ownership of land by a farmer against the collective farm (i.e., organically linking the struggle of today with the way of life that was established in the Ukrainian state) is always a significant task.

Two national organisms with a completely different concept of life are constantly pitted against each other - Ukraine and Russia. To link the organised struggle to this fact is to make it victorious.

All these processes in different areas of life must effectively coincide in

The zenith of the revolution is in the armed uprising. This fact must be constantly brought to the attention of the people.

The task of the OUN in modern times is to penetrate all Ukrainian strata, all areas of life, to develop in all areas of Ukraine and abroad where Ukrainians live, to initiate and conduct such actions so that the widest possible circles participate in them in various possible forms, in their own defence against extermination by the enemy, and in the indicated cases - the indicated offensive actions. In particular, special attention should continue to be paid to consciousness-raising, in word and deed.

The soldiers of the Soviet army form a separate segment, where we need to intensify our action. The purpose of this is to ensure that in the event of an armed breakdown, the soldiers of the Soviet army will go over to the side of the rebel armies, which are already forming the core of future national armies of millions today (no matter how strong they are). Our slogan - the division of the Russian Empire into nation states in terms of organisation - also penetrates here

- The division of the Soviet army into national armies. The key idea, nationality, provides a solution to all the problems associated with the struggle. Against the imperial army stand national armies, against the army of violence - armies of freedom!

The tasks of the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation camp are not limited to the Ukrainian territory and Ukrainian communities outside it. Victory over Russia is only possible when all enslaved peoples overthrow the prison as a single, united front.

Spreading the ideas of a common front, creating it in each place, coordinating actions, and planning together were the tasks of the time. The idea and concept of the ABN provides an answer to Moscow's policy of dispersion, as it creates the possibility of fighting for one's own national statehood also outside one's own ethnographic territory, linking the fate of all peoples into one. An independent Ukraine can be fought for in Turkestan and Siberia, and vice versa - for an independent Idel-Ural or Georgia in Ukraine.

We consider the Russian people to be an invader, so the sharpness of the Ukrainian anti-Russian front must not be dulled, nor must chatter be spread among the Ukrainian people. In general: the task of the OUN-UPA-UGVR is now in Ukraine and in the sub-Russian world in general, the first front (from the point of view of the West

second) to organise in a planned manner, to cement in a political and military sense the front of national liberation revolutions of enslaved peoples, waged according to one general plan and for the same goals. Area of action: the entire USSR and the countries of its "sphere of influence". The political organisation must be preserved under any circumstances, even if it is only a scattered group of like-minded people (in different centres), but with a steady outlook and a clear goal. We are convinced that no amount of terror will ever be able to liquidate our organisation. The moment of revolutionary disruption can never be predicted or calculated.

Many times, a small spark can start a big fire.

These, the most generally mentioned, are important in the event of a war, which does not change the main thrusts of our strategy, which aims to find the most favourable moment for armed in every situation. When war breaks out, a separate factor comes into play. Our attitude to it depends on it:

- a) the goals of the war proclaimed by the Western world, i.e. its attitude to the USSR and the division of the Russian empire; recognition of Ukraine as a sovereign factor and its attitude to other peoples enslaved by Russia;
- b) the strategic-military concept of the Western world, i.e. splitting fronts across the empire, or a unilateral Hitler-style attack, which ultimately stemmed from the political concept of war.

If the West had accepted our goals before the war, it would have meant the territories of Ukraine and other nations enslaved by Moscow from the destructive military action and concentrating on Russian territory, i.e. creating a second front behind the iron barrier.

When dealing with the enemy in one's own home, one must understand that he will only be finally defeated when he surrenders on his own land. Members of enslaved peoples who will be thrown onto Russian soil must take this into account. They will have to demobilise the insurgency in various ways, making it impossible for it to consolidate.

Obviously, there are different variants of military strategy. The success of one or the other depends on the correctness of the political concept of war. In the first phase of the war (unless something unforeseen happens within the USSR itself that creates an opportunity for us), we will have to focus on political action in the USSR, training military personnel, building up the rebel army, spreading it, increasing it, and

We will focus on consolidating our actions with the insurgencies and political formations of other nations, infiltrating the ranks of the Red Army, organising their transition to the insurgent army, and building up our military and political force, which we will put into full action at the right time. Of course, this tactic will be met with fierce counter-actions from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which we will have to fight against armed, but this is the only way to build a force that is still easier to maintain in time of war than it is today. Therefore, we are convinced that the possibilities of our action will be strengthened with the outbreak of war. If there should be a national uprising of the armed people, this will have to be decided on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the totality of the affairs and the situation within the empire and on the fronts of war.

It is possible that the West, having no other choice, will take a favourable attitude the facts in Ukraine. However, our organisation will not take part in any buffer solutions to the Ukrainian case, but will build its own strength from below, among the people, so that no order of the buffer Ukrainian "government" can actually be implemented without our approval, so that it is obvious to everyone that only the force that strictly pursues the Ukrainian cause can be the decisive force in Ukraine. The omnipresence of our network will force foreign factors to change their attitude towards Ukrainian selfhood. In the face of a fundamental denial of Ukrainian sovereignty, our struggle would not stop.

By building the first (in the West's view, the second) front on our own lands, we are fighting abroad to ensure that the West recognises our goals and adopts them as its own and proclaims them the goal of a war of liberation. A clear indicator of their acceptance should be the coordination of the West's actions with the second front through cooperation with the political coordination centre of underground movements and the military coordination centre of insurgent armies.

Until the West does this, there is no reason to believe in its good intentions. , for example, a Ukrainian army is formed in exile on the same principles and rights as the French army or the Dutch army within the framework of the Atlantean army, with the recognition of the political revolutionary Ukrainian dispossessioner by that army, all the promises of the West will remain empty words.

The idea of national-state liberation is so just that putting it forward in the least would not compromise the diplomatic situation of the Western alliances in the way that it complicates their pursuit of human freedom.

Our action abroad should be in the direction of the war a liberation character. Our task is to get help for our own action, based on our own strength.

## **We have no common language with Muscovites**

*In 1951 and 1952, when the Moscow-Bolshevik aggression in various parts of the free world created the possibility of a third world war, another form of Moscow imperialism emerged in the West, mainly in Germany and the United States, directed against the emigration of the peoples enslaved by Moscow. The so-called White Moscow political groups, led by A. Kerensky, launched an intense political campaign with a programme to destroy Bolshevism but preserve the empire by keeping "all the peoples of Russia" in further captivity. For their sabotage, they received great support from American circles; then such entities as the SONR, the ACWB, the CCAB, etc. emerged with the common task of bringing together the political forces of the emirates of the enslaved peoples, and turning their struggle against Moscow and its imperialism into a struggle only against the Bolshevik regime and the communist system.*

*These hostile to the Ukrainian cause ideas were labelled by St. Bandsra in his articles: "There is no common language with Muscovites", and in two subsequent articles - "The original sin of the pro-Russian concept" and "Open cards". The leadership of the OUN issued two statements supporting the joint "Positions of Ukrainian political institutions and organisations" of 27 December.*

*1952 and the joint "Declaration of National Political Centres and National Liberation Organisations" of the peoples enslaved by Moscow from 14. 12. 1952 (See: "OUN in the light of resolutions of the Great Assembly, Conferences and other documents on the struggle of 1929-1955", collection of documents, Library of the Ukrainian Underground, part 1. Edition of the OUN, 1955, pp. 264-282, "Our Situation Before the Current Events" and "The Complementary Situation of the OUN Leadership Abroad").*

*The article below was published under the signature of St. Bandera in the weekly. "Ukrainische Samostoynik", Munich, year iii, p. 42/143 from 12. 10. 1952 p.*

Ukrainian politics has long been characterised by a unanimous negative attitude to all attempts, overt or covert, to harness the Ukrainian cause to the Moscow imperialist wagon. Everywhere, beyond the reach of Moscow's violence, the Ukrainian national community treats such Moscow schemes as if they were enemy initiatives. I

Every attempt on the part of the Muscovites to make a break in the Ukrainian front is completely hopeless.

Meanwhile, the task of changing this consistent stance of Ukrainian politics is taken up by those American political circles that organise American actions in this area in the current psychological war against Bolshevism. They use various means to try to bring together the liberation struggle of the peoples enslaved by Moscow, primarily Ukraine, and the anti-regime, anti-communist tendencies among the Moscow people, represented by their political emigration. The basis for joint action should be, first and foremost, a negative attitude to Bolshevism as a regime and communist system, the struggle to eliminate it and establish a democratic system in its place. As for the state and political system in place of the USSR, the Russian Empire would have remained in its present form, to which Ukraine and other nations would have continued to belong, except that the very forms of their subordination would have been slightly changed. The maximum "concessions" that this concept would allow to the peoples fighting for their liberation from Moscow would be to postpone their state determination until later, after the joint defeat of Bolshevism and the establishment of democracy in the Russian Empire. Until then, Ukraine and other peoples would have to shift their liberation struggle to an anti-regime, anti-communist struggle and conduct it in terms of the indivisibility of the Russian empire, with an eye to Moscow's wishes.

This concept was met with unanimous and sharp opposition from all Ukrainian political circles in exile, when Moscow's factors in exile tried to put it into effect, while American orchestrators and patrons kept behind the scenes. Since then, American political action in the same direction has become more and more pronounced, making this pro-Russian, united-divide concept the official line of US policy. Various means of political pressure and cohesion should break the unanimity of the Ukrainian response and draw out the weak and amenable elements among the Ukrainian political emigration. The persistence of the American factors leading this campaign is ready to go to such they will interpret the position of Ukrainian side towards this concept as a factor of Ukrainian

American relations. That is, that the US political leadership will treat Ukrainian political forces in the same way as they treat their pro-Russian political actions.

These kinds of manifestations and messages are intended to cause confusion in Ukrainian politics in exile, to deprive it of its subject matter and turn it into a pliable object in the tactical games of foreign politics. In such a situation, all Ukrainian independence forces must demonstrate their national and political maturity and unwavering steadfastness in the position of our liberation cause.

First and foremost, we must categorically reject any suggestion that our stance against any Moscow plans, actions and forces should be interpreted in a different plane than from the perspective of the Ukrainian liberation struggle and politics. When someone tries to transform this into a relationship between us and the United States, this cannot be considered a respectful attitude, let alone an attitude that can be aspired to. Because the attitude to Moscow, to the Moscow nation and statehood, to all components and forms of Moscow imperialism is a basic issue of the life and development of the Ukrainian nation that has grown out of centuries of history. It is at the forefront of our minds. Instead, the current concept of US policy in the psychological war against Bolshevism is a matter of political tactics, and very dubious ones at that. From the point of view of the Ukrainian liberation struggle, the American action along the lines of unity with the United States is a phenomenon of only opportunistic importance, regardless of its possible intensity and duration.

The question of our attitude to the various Moscow forces and actions that affect Ukrainian affairs, in particular the liberation struggle and independence of Ukraine, is assessed, decided and implemented only in accordance with Ukrainian advice. The essence of this attitude cannot be affected by the fact that these Moscow actions are in conjunction with or supported by third parties, even if we were to have good relations with those parties.

The action of the above-mentioned American circles once again puts before Ukrainian political forces abroad the task of cooperating with Moscow's anti-communist, but imperialist environments. Contents.

The homogeneous response of all Ukrainian independence forces in such a fundamental matter of liberation policy cannot be attributed to the desire of interested foreign factors, nor to what they support their desires. This response is cut off by the very nature, goals and position of both real partners: Ukrainian and Moscow.

The goals of the liberation struggle of Ukraine and the allied peoples are unchanged and quite clear: complete liberation from the invasive and violent imperialism of the Moscow nation in general and its current form, Bolshevism, in particular. Destruction of the communist system and regime. Complete severance of all ties with Russia. Building sovereign national states on the ethnographic space of each nation.

Historical experience convincingly teaches us that Russia, despite all its internal changes, has never changed or weakened its imperialism - its drive to conquer, exploit and destroy other peoples, including the Ukrainian. As a result of national enslavement, Ukraine, like other peoples in the same situation, suffered the worst disasters of all those that had marked every previous Moscow state, political and social system. Each regime of the Moscow prison of peoples concentrated its forces and all the most brutal means to maintain and consolidate the enslavement, robbery and destruction of Ukraine and other peoples. The Moscow people not only did not oppose this, but as a whole were and remained the bearers of this imperialism. The systems and forces vying for power in Russia, trying to unite the sympathies of the majority of the Moscow people and tarnishing the unpopular features of the enemy, have always competed with each other in terms of who would gain more for Russian imperialism. Every Moscow state, whether tsarist, democratic or Bolshevik, has always used treachery and perfidy against Ukraine and other peoples, and turned every form of alliance into the most horrific enslavement. Thus, the enemy was not only the regime in question, whether tsarist or Bolshevik, not only the state and social system, but the Moscow nation itself, driven by the demons of imperialism, the desire to become bigger, more powerful, richer, not by its own growth, but by enslaving other peoples, robbing them and absorbing them into itself.

The goal of our liberation struggle is complete independence from Moscow

through the construction of a sovereign, united Ukrainian state, be replaced by anything else. The mere change of Russia's regime and system, with any dependence of Ukraine on it, is neither the essence nor the stage of Ukrainian liberation. The modern liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people against Bolshevik Moscow is simultaneously a struggle against the imperialism of the Moscow nation in general, as Bolshevism is a form and creation of this imperialism.

Ukraine can create a common anti-Bolshevik front with such foreign forces that have a positive attitude not only to the struggle itself but also to our liberation goals, and fighting against a common enemy, have no hostile intentions towards Ukraine. Such a natural and organised common front is created by the peoples enslaved by Moscow.

However, there are no Moscow forces that would have a positive attitude to the independence struggle of Ukraine and its allies, that would oppose the imperialist actions and tendencies of Moscow. Moscow's anti-Bolshevik currents and sentiments are against the regime itself, against the communist system and order, and not against the national and political enslavement of other peoples. Various emigrant Moscow parties and organisations, despite their declarative anti-Bolshevik attitude, focus their actual activities on overcoming the Ukrainian independence movement. Thus, when it comes to maintaining the Moscow empire, they compete to the same extent as the Bolsheviks and complement their work where the Bolsheviks' hands cannot reach. In this, there is a de facto division of roles between the developing forms of Moscow's imperialism.

The history of 1917-1920 is repeating itself, when the white and red Moscow forces, despite the greatest mutual enmity, equally turned their main forces to the destruction of the independence of Ukraine and other restored national states. Denikin took all the aid from the Western powers intended for the fight against Bolshevism and turned it mainly against the Ukrainian armies, which were fighting against the same Bolshevism. In the same way, the Moscow imperialists in exile, under the guise of anti-Bolshevik action and a common front, are now trying to seize the policy of the Western powers in this area and direct their action on a single-dominant track, to the detriment of the liberation struggle of Ukraine and the

of all the peoples enslaved by Moscow. They are trying to push the cause of Ukraine's state independence off the political horizon and to establish in world politics the belief that the essence of the entire anti-Bolshevik struggle is only the removal of the communist regime and system, and that the self-preservation of the Moscow empire is not subject to any discussion.

Ukrainian independence politics must draw the appropriate conclusions from the fact that in the Moscow camp there are only forces extremely hostile to the cause of Ukraine's state independence, and that in this view we are still dealing with a united front of Bolsheviks and anti-Communist Moscow imperialists. In such a situation, any attempt to bring Ukrainian politics to common ground with Moscow's anti-regime forces is tantamount to an attempt to bring the Ukrainian liberation struggle to capitulation to Moscow's imperialism. Any ties with the enemy on such a platform of surrender would be a crime of national treason.

Just as there are no other active forces on Moscow's side but imperialist forces that are most hostile to the liberation struggles of Ukraine and other peoples, so there can be only one posture on our side against them: resistance and struggle. Struggle against Moscow, against Bolshevism and every other form of its invasive imperialism, until complete liberation, until the Moscow nation renounces its attempts to enslave Ukraine and other peoples agrees to live with them in peaceful relations, on the basis of respect for the independence and all rights of each nation. And until such time as non-imperialist forces in the Moscow camp come forward with such a programme and begin to act along the lines of a positive attitude towards the main goals of the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other enslaved peoples, there can be no common ground with any Moscow factors.

## **The original sin of the pro-Russian concept**

*In this article, published in Ukrainian Samostoynyk, Munich, Year III, no. 44/145 of 26 October 1952, and in the Ukrainian Family, Toronto, Year V, no. 45/181, Stepan Bandera examines the main motives and goals of the pro-Russian concept in American politics. Compare the articles: "The Third World War..." and "There is no common language with Muscovites".*

Ukraine's independent policy abroad is confronted with increasingly clear and strong attempts by American political factors to reduce the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other former Soviet peoples to favourable for Moscow's imperialists, to combine them into one political, acting and organisational whole with Moscow's anti-regime, but imperialist tendencies. To properly understand the essence of these attempts, we must consider the main motives and goals of this pro-Russian concept in American politics, and not just deal with its partial specific manifestations that emerge in current developments. At the same time, we can only deal with such motives and goals that have found the right of citizenship and their proportion in American political thought, even if they are justified by the rationale of American politics. Instead, we must ignore the various trends that operate behind the scenes in American politics and that use this policy for their own hidden purposes, even if the actual impact of these behind-the-scenes trends has been very significant.

The main source of the dominant pro-Russian concept in American politics is the thesis that the fight against Bolshevism on a global scale must be a fight against the Bolshevik regime itself, its social and state system, and its further expansion, and in no way can it be a fight against Russia as an empire or against the Moscow nation. On the contrary, the struggle against Bolshevism should bring Russia liberation from its internal shackles and ensure the continued preservation of the Moscow nation's imperial position. Therefore, the Moscow people should reciprocate America's friendly attitude towards them, not defend the Bolshevik regime, but rise up against it in alliance with the Western nations. The enemy is Bolshevism itself, as a regime and system. The Moscow Nation for America

- not an enemy, but a friend. Likewise, for other peoples, both those enslaved in the USSR and those further afield, the Moscow nation, according to this concept, is neither an enslaver nor an attacker, but also a victim of the Bolshevik regime.

This concept applies two different measures to Moscow's imperialism, depending on the territorial limits of its action. Within the pre-World War II borders, it is benign and just; the Russian empire within these borders is inviolable, and the affiliation of numerous non-Moscow peoples to it must be preserved. Instead, the further expansion of Moscow and Bolshevism that has taken place since that war, as well as the preparations for the future, is an inherent imperialism that must of course be put to an end.

This attitude of American policy towards Moscow's imperialism stems from the realisation that it is capturing the entire Moscow nation. Therefore, in an attempt to win sympathy for itself, American circles want to respect its imperialist aspirations as much as possible. The price for this must be the fate of the peoples long enslaved by Moscow.

Bolshevism gives the greatest success to Moscow imperialism, and it is also its most perfect form. And every attempt to rival it in this respect is completely hopeless. But the united-democratic conception of American policy tries to flirt with a different attitude. It claims that it will achieve what neither the Tsarist nor Bolshevik regimes achieved, namely, that the anti-Moscow liberation movements of the enslaved peoples will voluntarily submit to Moscow imperialism under the American omophorion, renounce their independent goals and remain part of the Russian non-communist empire.

Moscow imperialism already has Ukraine and other nations in its claws, and it has nothing to give. But it has not yet succeeded in breaking the independence struggle of these peoples, especially the Ukrainian one. Even Bolshevism is forced to make at least confessional concessions to them, holding up the form of the so-called Soviet socialist republics and their voluntary union as a bait. Therefore, forcing the capitulation of the independence movements to the emigrant exponents of Moscow imperialism would be a significant service to

It is a matter of American politics. This is what Moscow's emigration circles want her to do, and this is what she is trying to do - win the sympathy of Muscovites.

American leaders had to realise that within the USSR there were only national liberation and anti-Bolshevik revolutionary movements of the peoples enslaved by Moscow, especially the Ukrainian people. Instead, there is not a single Moscow-based anti-Bolshevik movement that is actively engaged in revolutionary struggle. Among the Moscow people, there are only anti-regime sentiments that would like to change the communist system, but do not think of taking the path of revolutionary struggle. And Muscovites do not even have opposition sentiments against the imperialist policy and expansion of the USSR.

The American conception of the struggle against Bolshevism requires that there be an active anti-Bolshevik movement of the Moscow people. It sees the best, and perhaps the only, opportunity for this in bringing existing national revolutionary movements under the banner of the Russian anti-regime movement. The Americans hope that perhaps in this way they can awaken some anti-Bolshevik forces and actions among the Muscovites. At the very least, it may be possible to create the external impression that there is a Russian anti-Bolshevik movement in the USSR, in which Muscovites, Ukrainians, and other nationalities are fighting side by side. This is the second main motive behind the American concept of one common anti-Bolshevik front of the peoples of the USSR, a front of Muscovites and nations enslaved by Moscow.

The third motive for these efforts is the desire to concentrate all the energy of active and potential anti-Bolshevik forces within the USSR on a single goal: the destruction of the Bolshevik regime and system. To do this, the Americans want to eliminate everything that is or could be the subject of conflict between these various forces, and that directs their anti-Bolshevik aspirations towards different, often opposing, positive goals and makes a united, coordinated struggle impossible. For American policy - to overcome Bolshevism in the easiest way and with the least amount of sacrifice - it would be desirable for all active and potential anti-Bolshevik forces in the USSR to have only one goal: the elimination of Bolshevism. Then it would be

It is easiest to create a united front. But since the negative goal itself is in no way sufficient and cannot be an appropriate spring for the struggle, the positive goals of all forces must be coordinated. This coordination, according to the American concept, should consist in the fact that all nations must subordinate their national goals to Moscow's imperialist demands, because the Americans depend primarily on the accession of the Muscovites, and these will not react from an imperialist position.

These are, in our opinion, the main motives behind the American concept of squeezing the national liberation movements of the peoples enslaved by Moscow into the Russian anti-regime front. They are allegedly justified by American political rationale and are in line with the main plan of US policy against the USSR. American political circles, in adopting this concept, may have in mind its maximum and minimum implementation. The minimum would be that even if the implementation of this plan did not produce any forceful and effective results in the active anti-Bolshevik struggle, there would still be works abroad that would give the impression that there was a Russian anti-regime front, in which all anti-Bolshevik forces in the USSR were united. This could be used by American policy in its tactics against the USSR, as well as in the mobilisation of the entire West against Bolshevism in the American sense explained above. It would be a fight against Bolshevism itself, not Russia, and the people of Moscow would be on the side of the West.

However, the relevant US leadership circles responsible for the adoption of this concept in US policy seem to be completely oblivious to its negative effects. At the same time, they act this way, and not otherwise, not as a result of an incorrect assessment of the national liberation movements of the peoples enslaved by Moscow. They do so because American politics is completely indifferent to the goals for which these peoples are fighting, it is only interested in the struggle itself, the quantitative effect of this struggle in the present and its potential in the future as a factor that to some extent reduces or paralyses Bolshevik forces. At the same time, national liberation movements are treated as a factor that already exists, is predetermined, has no choice, and in any case and under any arrangement of international forces will actively fight against Bolshevism. Neither the existence of this

factor, nor about anti-Bolshevik education, because it cannot be otherwise. But the Moscow anti-Bolshevik revolutionary movement has to be created, and for this we have to work hard.

The effectiveness of the anti-Bolshevik struggle of national liberation movements and the imaginary Moscow anti-regime resistance is also given inappropriate weight. The comparison of the single mass of the Moscow people with the fragmented, complex image of the peoples enslaved by Moscow has a suggestive effect. The role of Muscovites and other nationalities in the entire structure of the Russian Empire is compared, and this comparison is inappropriately transferred to the plane of the anti-Bolshevik struggle. They say that just as Muscovites created and maintain the empire, so directing them to actively fight Bolshevism would immediately lead to the fall of Bolshevism. And the struggle of the Ukrainian and other non-Moscow peoples is only of peripheral importance, both in terms of territory and structure.

We are dealing with an obvious mixing of facts with unrealistic dreams, leading to the most paradoxical concepts. This happens only because of a general lack of understanding of the actual situation within the borders of the Russian Empire and under the influence of the chatter that is systematically and systematically spread by all Muscovites among the foreign world.

But the root of all the mistakes of American policy and plans against the USSR is the thesis that the Moscow nation, Moscow imperialism, and Bolshevism are three separate, not organically fused phenomena, that the enemy for all other nations is Bolshevism itself, and that in the struggle against it, the Moscow people can be an ally.

## Open maps

*Stepan Bandera's third article on the pro-Russian trend in American politics in the 1950s is closely related to the previous two. It was published in the weekly Ukrainian Samostoynik, Munich, year iii, part 46/147 of 9. 11. 1952 p.*

The pro-Russian tendency of the current American policy in the Cold War with the USSR appears to be mainly justified by the desire to unite all anti-Bolshevik forces into one front. If this motive were to prevail, then efforts should be focused on strengthening and coordinating those existing anti-Bolshevik forces and actions that are most potent and dynamic and that can form a common front, with a view to achieving consonant goals in the fight against a common enemy. Such natural allies are the peoples who are fighting against the Moscow-Bolshevik enslavement for their national and state independence and have no hostile intentions against each other.

Meanwhile, the American action in this section draws a clear line between the liberation struggles of the so-called satellite countries that fell under Moscow's domination in the last world war and the same liberation struggles of the peoples who were enslaved by Moscow long ago. Both groups of peoples are in a similar struggle against Bolshevism and against all enslavement by Moscow's imperialism, against the communist system imposed by Moscow - for full state autonomy and independence. The actual situation of the one and the other is very similar, and the path to liberation and the possibilities of struggle are the same. But American circles not only do not help cement a common front between the two peoples, but also prevent this by their different interpretations. This clearly demonstrates that the postulate of a single front of anti-Bolshevik forces and their unity does not solve the problem.

The completely different attitude of American policy towards the liberation goals of one and the other group of peoples stems from the fundamental programme against Moscow imperialism. In the pre-World War II period, this imperialism was tested in contemporary American politics. Therefore.

It does not support the independence struggles of these peoples, but only interprets their struggle as anti-regime resistance. It is no longer willing to accept further Russian expansion and supports, at least declaratively, the struggle for state independence of the peoples that Moscow has conquered after the last war.

By not caring about creating and cementing a genuine common anti-Bolshevik front where it is possible and natural, as a front of enslaved peoples against Moscow imperialism and its instrument, communism, American politicians are wasting their energy on connecting the incompatible. But this is only an external form. For they must also be well aware that bringing together Moscow's imperialist, albeit anti-communist, tendencies and the liberation struggles of enslaved peoples will not create either strength or dynamic, planar action, but will only lead to mutual paralysis; they are obviously not concerned with strength, with action, or with a real common front. The main goal of such a policy is to gain the sympathy of Moscow circles that hold imperialist positions but are opposed to the Bolshevik regime and system. This does not mean their active revolutionary struggle, but rather to draw them away from supporting and defending Bolshevism for Moscow-imperialist reasons and to arouse their passive indifference or even sympathy for the enemies of the USSR, as they do not violate the integrity of the empire. The second goal is to tie up uncertain allies, such as Moscow's anti-communist imperialists, internally, to keep them under the shah by linking the liberation forces of the peoples enslaved by Moscow to them. In such a view, our liberation struggle is interpreted only as a subject of policy against Moscow imperialism - firstly, as a price for its ennoblement and, secondly, as a means of sustenance and security.

We regard this policy as completely erroneous and hopeless even in terms of its success. By doing so, the Americans will not win the favour of Moscow's imperialism, but will only cement its self-confidence and aggressiveness. No matter what they do, Moscow imperialism is and will remain their own enemy, as well as that of the West, and not just one form of it - Bolshevism. By competing with Bolshevism to win the sympathy of the imperialist sentiments of the Moscow people, the United States is putting itself in a position in which it must lose, because

Stalin will not be surpassed in this. Instead of mobilising the whole freedom-loving world against both kinds of the same enemy - Moscow imperialism and communism, instead of attacking and depriving it, US policy makers help to cement the sense of invincibility of Moscow imperialism by the fact that even a power like the US does not dare to oppose it.

But the greatest disaster of the pro-Russian concept in American politics discussed here is that it intends to stab the national liberation struggles of Ukraine and other peoples enslaved by Moscow in the back and closes the door to understanding and cooperation between them and the US anti-Bolshevik efforts.

This concept negatively relates to the essence of the liberation struggle of Ukraine and other nations, i.e. their desire for full state independence and complete elimination of any dependence on Moscow.

This concept requires us to renounce this basic goal, to reduce our struggle to an anti-regime struggle and to actually submit to the demands of Moscow's emigrant imperialists to keep Ukraine and other peoples within the Russian empire. These are not the same demands that every Moscow imperial system, from the Czarist to Bolshevism, imposed on us by means of the most terrible terror. Because of our disobedience to enemy attempts and unbreakable pursuit of freedom and state independence! Ukraine has made and continues to make the greatest sacrifices.

And now the American factors that support the stirrups of the Moscow imperialists are coming with the same demands. They come as if they were friends, promising to help in the anti-Bolshevik liberation struggle, but demanding that we renounce the inherent goals of the liberation struggle. This is just as if someone offered a person struggling with poverty to get rich on the condition that he or she would take his or her own life. There is no other way to view it. Because cooperation with Moscow imperialism on the basis of the anti-regime struggle alone, while ignoring the cause of Ukraine's state independence, would mean a retreat from the main goals and essence of the liberation struggle.

The Ukrainian liberation and revolutionary movement will never do this under any circumstances. It will not betray the flag and the goals of Ukraine's age-old struggle,

that cost the Ukrainian nation so many victims. It will not because the goal and path of Ukraine's liberation struggle is determined only by the will and vital needs of the Ukrainian nation, not by the international situation, nor by the desires or influences of external forces. If the Ukrainian people were give in to pressure or to various lures and capitulate to Moscow's imperialism, they would first of all stop fighting the Bolshevik form of that imperialism in order to avoid, or at least reduce, the terrible victims and persecution. And everyone interested in this should know that in Ukraine, the Caucasus, Turkestan, and other countries with independence struggles, Bolshevik terror and extermination were and are without comparison worse than in Muscovy, because of the enmity between Moscow imperialism and the rebellious national and independent aspirations of those peoples. Therefore, reconciliation with that imperialism would be more understandable in the sub-Bolshevik reality than in the American one.

The fact that the Ukrainian liberation movement has never thought of capitulating to Moscow, no matter who it is, is a consequence of its internal steadfastness and consistency in its aspirations. But the trends in American politics that are trying to steer him down the path of capitulation, although they will not do anything in this direction are nevertheless dealing him a very big blow to his moral and political nature. This will be well used by the Bolsheviks as an argument for the moral breakdown of the anti-Bolshevik liberation forces. They say that even the Americans are against our independence, and if Bolshevism fell, you would remain in Moscow's captivity, just as you were under the tsar, because the white Moscow imperialists would have the support of America.

The Ukrainian national liberation movement will resist such an addition to the enemy's onslaught. All Ukrainian factors and individual units in exile must unanimously demonstrate national resistance to all attempts to remove anyone from their independent position. Even if there were some apostates, they would have placed themselves outside the Ukrainian independence camp and no one could have treated them as its participants or spokesmen.

There is no excuse for breaking the national front against Moscow's imperialism. It is a surrender to its emigration,

anti-Communist dissent is the same kind of national treason as before Bolshevism. And the circumstances of the first and second retreats from the independence position should influence the sharper condemnation of such crimes in exile. Because in the Ukrainian lands, people often act under the most terrible terror, wanting to save their lives and their loved ones. And this kind of apostasy for personal or group benefits, or for the sake of a political career, in the midst of freer conditions in exile, deserves even sharper condemnation.

There is also no justification for the fact that cooperation with the Moscow imperialists and the commemoration of the cause of state independence of Ukraine and other enslaved peoples should be seen in terms of cooperation with the Americans on the anti-Bolshevik front. In fact, such demands have nothing positive to do with either Ukrainian-American relations or our struggle against Bolshevism, and can only be an obstacle in both. It is about our attitude to Moscow's imperialism and our renunciation of our independence goals.

Thus, American mediation, the price of American aid, and anti-Bolshevik guidance do not justify anything. Just as the servants of Bolshevik Moscow, the so-called government of the Ukrainian SSR, are not justified by arguments that they are using Soviet forms to retain and develop at least something of their own statehood, Ukrainian culture, economy, and so on, within the limits of existing possibilities, or that if the United States were to win over the USSR, American-backed white Moscow imperialists would come to power and eliminate even the forms of Ukrainian separateness that existed under the Bolsheviks.

Every aid for anti-Bolshevik action, insofar as it is combined with anti-independence, pro-Russian policy, does more harm than good to the Ukrainian liberation cause. No actions or achievements made with such help, however respectable and useful they may be in themselves, can balance the greatest, most fundamental harm, which is a breakthrough in the united front of liberationist, independent politics. But every single action with someone else's help, based only on an anti-regime, non-independent concept, has the same element that makes it worthless or simply harmful.

For example, anti-Bolshevik propaganda on the radio or

another form, which should mobilise and intensify anti-Bolshevik sentiments and actions among the Ukrainian or other people, but at the same time does not touch upon hostility to Moscow imperialism, aspirations for national and state independence, or even shows a negative attitude towards these drivers of the liberation struggle. Such propaganda is harmful to the liberation struggle, to the entire anti-Bolshevik front, because it has a demobilising effect on the main springs of the anti-Bolshevik struggle. It causes the national liberation movements fighting Bolshevism to become bitter and hostile towards the inspirers of such propaganda and produces the opposite effect to that which its inspirers would have wished for themselves.

For the liberation struggles of Ukraine and other peoples, genuine political support for the goals of these struggles and recognition of their inherent importance in international development and in the relevant arenas of world politics are of the greatest value. Every practical assistance for the preparation and conduct of the liberation struggle, for independent anti-Bolshevik activity or for the nurturing of Ukrainian national values and forces is of great importance and value, when such assistance is based on a positive attitude to the very essence of Ukraine's struggle for state independence. The minimum prerequisite for the assistance of a state to be favourable and useful for the liberation movement is that this state should not have such goals or pursue such a policy that would contradict the main goals of the Ukrainian liberation struggle and that it should not link its assistance to demands that contradict the positions of Ukrainian independence policy.

The clear and unwavering negative stance of all Ukrainian forces in exile against the pro-Russian concept in American politics and its attempts to drag them onto that track is important not only for the Ukrainian cause, but also for the correctness of American policy itself and for the relationship between the front of the liberation struggle of the peoples enslaved by Moscow and the anti-Bolshevik actions of the Western powers. We must do everything we can to refute misconceptions and misunderstandings, to dispel false illusions, to overcome harmful concepts and to prevent undesirable developments in relations between the two sides. Objective evidence suggests that our liberation struggle and the anti-Bolshevik policy of the United States and other Western powers should

find common ground in the fight against a common enemy. For for one and for the other, the same enemy is Moscow imperialism, in every form, and communism as a system.

It would be fake to expect that the enemies of the USSR will be able to use the anti-Bolshevik struggle of the Ukrainian people for their own purposes, regardless of how they themselves will treat their liberation struggle. True, we will neither stop our anti-Bolshevik struggle nor weaken it under the influence of the unfavourable attitude of the United States or other Western powers. But the plan of the struggle, the strategy of the liberation revolution, can take into account the broader plan of a single-minded struggle, so that by joint forces and coordinated actions we can defeat the common enemy as soon as possible, as long as we have an alliance and guarantees that a common victory will also give us the achievement of our liberation goals. , if we are not treated as allies and our goals are not respected, then we must conduct our struggle in a completely separate manner, as we have done so far, bearing in mind that it cannot be used by forces that have hostile intentions towards our independence.

If Moscow's imperialist invaders of a different colour tried to replace Bolshevism in Ukraine, the Ukrainian people would fight against them in the same way as against the Bolsheviks, regardless of whether they had foreign support and from which states. During the Second World War, the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement fought on two fronts - against Bolshevism and Hitler's invaders. Hitler wanted to turn Ukraine into his colony, just like Moscow, so the situation was understandable. But what sense would it make for America or other Western powers to become Ukraine's enemy in order to help the Muscovites maintain an empire that would one day turn its horns against the West again?

We consider the pro-Russian concept of American policy, with its connivance with Moscow imperialists and its attempts to hand over to them the liberation struggles of enslaved peoples, in its latest conventions, to be harmful and senseless, both from our point of view and from the point of view of the rationale of the American and world struggle against Bolshevism.

We see it as beneficial only for Moscow's imperialism of all kinds. But so far, this concept not only exists, but also determines American policy in our area. Our resolute stance

It is not only the cause of the liberation of Ukraine and other peoples enslaved by Moscow that is being defended against it. It also aims at the good of the global front for the defence of the life and freedom of peoples against the crushing onslaught of Moscow imperialism and its instrument, communism.

## **On the issue of the main cadres of the national liberation revolution**

*The assertions of some Ukrainian politicians abroad, most notably Ivan Bahrianyi, that there were no nationally conscious young people in Ukraine who could lead or continue the liberation struggle for independence, caused confusion and even pessimism among the Ukrainian community and the ranks of the OUN membership. Claiming that there was a lack of nationally conscious personnel, the proponents of this thesis simultaneously suggested that the Bolshevik Komsomol personnel should be used and fought with their help, not under nationalist or even national slogans, but by exploiting the mistakes of the communist regime and its delusions. Rejecting these claims, Stepan Bandera in this article proves them wrong.*

*The article was published, signed by "C.B.", in the monthly magazine "Liberation Path", London, UK, year VI, book 5/68, May 1953.*

The issue of cadres is of fundamental importance for every national political and social movement, and in particular for the national liberation revolution. The quality and quantity of the cadres already involved in revolutionary action, and those who, by their own instruction, will be activated in it during the expansion of the revolutionary struggle, decides on the direction, strength and success of the entire revolutionary process. Therefore, the proper resolution of this issue must affect the development and outcome of the liberation struggle. It is necessary to draw appropriate conclusions from the experience and analysis of previous struggles for state independence in order not to repeat the same mistakes that have already led to breakdown and defeat.

This is not to say that the issue of the cadres who should organise and drive the national liberation revolution and the development of an independent state is neglected or underestimated in Ukrainian political thought. However, it is often subject to inappropriate interpretation, which leads to erroneous conclusions and gives rise to false political guidelines.

The main and most general disadvantage that the case

The issue of human resources is seen only as a matter of statistics - an already existing, existing condition, as a ready-made given to which the concept of a liberation movement must aspire. With this approach, the question is, of course, how and where, and whether there are appropriate cadres - with appropriate instruction, training, organisation and uniforms - who would be able to successfully lead a national revolution, eliminate the enemy from Ukraine and achieve an independent Ukrainian state?

This attitude of the question immediately suppresses the negative answer: "no!" If there are no suitable personnel, then there is no one to launch the liberation revolution, no one to organise state life on their own. The conclusion is that there is nothing to rush into, the cause of liberation is up to us, through a national revolution

- real, genuine state independence is not within our reach. This extreme pessimism is the source, or only the main argument, of all anti-independence tendencies, all orientations towards foreign forces, reconciliation with Ukraine's non-sovereignty, the concept of slow evolution, etc. This argument is also used by enemies and various foreign opponents of Ukraine's state independence.

In Ukrainian political life abroad, another trend has emerged that stems from the same roots, but tries to find a middle way. It approaches the issue of personnel in the same way, taking as a basis the situation created by the hostile reality, and comes to the conclusion that Ukraine does not have enough personnel who would raise the struggle for the implementation of the nationalist concept of liberation and state independence. However, this trend does not completely reject the liberation revolution and independence, but only wants to change their internal content in such a way as to be suitable for the guidance of active cadres formed by Bolshevik reality.

Through the change in the content of the anti-Bolshevik liberation revolution, he hopes to obtain ready-made personnel for it. We will deal with this area in the next part of this article.

The fundamental mistake common to all of these areas lies in the very basis - an inappropriate attitude to the question itself, which cuts off a negative answer from above. Every state, every socio-political system, and every system, until it has exhausted its vital force, tries to ensure its longevity and eliminate and destroy all threats to its existence. These efforts are especially important in the

of the cadre. Each system tries, by its own methods, but with the greatest attention and pressure, to educate and organise the strongest, most numerous cadres in its own spirit, for its own maintenance, and likewise to prevent the formation of cadres of any direction that competes for its overthrow. And there is no need to talk the consistency and recklessness with which the Bolsheviks do this. But we know from our own history, from its various periods, that every occupier of Ukrainian lands, regardless of the system, eliminated elements hostile to it and did not allow independent cadres to be retained, developed and formed.

No system that does not want to destroy itself educates and forms personnel ready for a revolution against it. It can only, in spite of its attempts, create discontent, hatred and hostility towards itself, towards the bearers and supports of this system among the people it controls. This creates a fertile ground - psychological, national-political and socio-economic - for the growth and formation of personnel ready to fight for liberation from the oppression of this system, for its overthrow and the creation of a new order.

But mere dissatisfaction, even extreme hatred of the state of enslavement, of the system and the regime, does not yet form a cadre of active fighters for the liberation revolution. This can only be done by a revolutionary idea, a revolutionary organisation that carries and spreads this idea, and its revolutionary action, active struggle against the enemy, mobilisation, and the training of a wider circle of fighters for liberation. The question of the active cadres of the liberation revolution can only find a positive solution if it is posed in its proper sense: of revolutionary dynamics, diligence, activation and growth. Not to look for ready-made cadres, because they never exist, except in a system is already tending to fall, but only to educate them, mobilise them and organise them from people who are predisposed to this by their attitude and character.

The creation and formation of cadres for the liberation struggle is the most essential, the main task of the entire revolutionary process. Most of the attention, energy, and revolutionary action must be directed at capturing more and more of the best people with the idea, so that they can move from a state of passive acquiescence to the hostile system

to bring them into a state of active resistance and overcoming the enemy; to create from them, through organisational work and the development of the revolutionary struggle, a cadre of conscious fighters for liberation and for building a new system of national liberation and national independence, freedom and justice. The main part of the struggle of a revolutionary organisation against the enemy is the struggle for the human soul, for ideological influence on the entire nation, for the spread of the idea and concept of the liberation revolution among the broadest masses of the people, their enthusiasm for this idea and, through this, their joining the side of the liberation struggle. This struggle for each person, for influence on the people as a whole, is reflected throughout the revolutionary struggle at every stage. Growing success in this is the surest basis for the development and eventual victory of the entire revolution.

The factors that bring people to the side of the revolution are: a set of ideas, revolutionary organisation and action. Of particular importance is ideology, which defines the goals of the liberation revolution, its programme in the fundamental issues of the new order and the way to implement these goals. Idea is the soul, the generating and driving force of the entire liberation movement, its most essential, unchanging essence. The vitality, durability and victory of the revolution depends primarily on the strength of the idea that drives it, on how it corresponds to the spirit, nature, life aspirations and needs of the people, how it expresses their best impulses and mobilises the noble, dynamic, heroic elements of the nation and the same foundations in the spirit of the individual.

In the overall development of the liberation revolution, and in particular in the mobilisation and education of cadres, the basic ideas must be a constant, unchanging factor. If they are changed, if they are added for tactical reasons to the guidance of heterogeneous elements, then these ideas immediately lose their impetuous force, and the revolutionary movement becomes confused and withers away.

Abroad, a trend has emerged that tries to influence the change in the ideological and programmatic positions of the revolutionary liberation movement, in the spirit of bringing them closer to the communist programme. The main argument of this trend is the assertion that otherwise the national liberation struggle will not have sufficiently numerous and active personnel. This thesis is substantiated by the following considerations.

Among the bulk of the Ukrainian people, in particular among the generations that grew up and were brought up in the sub-Bolshevik reality, there is no element that has developed the conviction, either by their own or acquired thoughts, that communist theory is false and evil. If there are any, they are in a very small percentage. As a result of the total domination of all life, all areas and manifestations of human thought by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the general population in Ukraine has developed the belief that the communist doctrine is good and correct in itself, and that only Bolshevik practice is bad. The contradiction between communist theory and Bolshevik practice, which is everywhere and is felt most acutely by the masses, creates the only suitable basis for an anti-Bolshevik revolution. The revolutionary programme and action must look for ready ground in the general conviction prevalent among the masses, and build on the knowledge that already exists and forms a negative attitude towards Bolshevism.

The main error of this trend lies in the conclusion that the hatred of Bolshevik practice and Bolshevik lies widespread among the people relates only to the regime, to the existing arrangements of the Bolshevik system of oppression and exploitation, but does not affect the communist programme at all, because the views of the general public remain captive to communist ideas.

This duality in the assessment of the attitudes of the masses is not justified. The Bolshevik reality presents the communist doctrine and practice of the Soviet system to the entire nation in the same way. Both are imposed by the same methods of total coercion on the population, with the extermination of anything that would be in any way opposed. Both the communist programme and the whole of Soviet reality, in all its forms, are presented by the cynically false Bolshevik propaganda as the highest achievement, progress and unprecedented happiness for the people. All the practices of Bolshevik despotism, extreme oppression, begging of the masses, and the most horrific terror are justified by Bolshevik principles and goals, and the building of communism according to the Marxist-Leninist programme. Therefore, in people's minds, the communist programme and Bolshevik practice are one and the same. The same hatred that lives in the people for the Bolshevik regime and system is no less true for

against the whole communist doctrine.

Every action of active fighters joining the national liberation revolution must be based on hatred of Bolshevism as a whole and directed at those elements that have it. There are many such elements, and they make up the vast majority of the people. Not only the older generations, but also the middle and younger ones have a deep practical knowledge of communism in all its forms, and their bitter experiences have created in them a hostile attitude towards Bolshevism. This spontaneous hostility to Bolshevik enslavement, the desire to free oneself from it, the desire for a different, free life for the whole nation and for each individual, and love for the motherland are the grounds for the liberation struggle that already exist and are the signs of the people from whom the cadres of the national anti-Bolshevik revolution must be formed. This basis is completely sufficient. And the rest should be supplemented by the idea, programme of the nationalist, liberation movement, revolutionary organisation and action of the revolutionary struggle. Natural patriotic feelings should be developed into a crystallised national and independent consciousness, the goals of the liberation struggle and the way of free life in an independent state should be clearly defined by spreading nationalist ideas and programmes, the concept of national revolution should show the way to the overthrow of hateful Bolshevism and Moscow's enslavement and the construction of an independent Ukrainian state, and the system of revolutionary actions and organisational work should orientate the entire nation towards the revolutionary liberation movement, activate the bravest, most combative elements and organisational bodies.

At the same time, the revolutionary organisation that initiates, leads and manages the liberation struggle must be aware of its role, that it must mobilise and form cadres of fighters for national liberation, and not look for them. This is all that the Ukrainian nationalist, revolutionary movement carries, and it corresponds to the soul of the Ukrainian people, their desires and needs, because it was born out of this. But this movement must show firm confidence in its ideas, consistency and firmness in following its path. This is convincing, admirable and affirming.

Of particular importance is the issue of leading cadres of the revolutionary struggle. They are selected from the broader cadre of those who are active in the revolutionary struggle and who are best placed to develop an awareness of the ideological content and plan

of the national revolution, and who, by their personal attributes - character, abilities and skills, are given leading functions.

It is completely false to assert that elements capable of playing a leading role in the anti-Bolshevik revolution and in building an independent state life can be found only among the cadres of so-called ideological, disillusioned communists. This assertion is based on the argument that the most dynamic, active, capable and ideological element of the generations that grew up in the sub-Bolshevik reality is organised and educated in the Komsomol and the Communist Party. Only such an element has the appropriate leadership qualities, initiative, creative abilities, and only it could acquire the relevant knowledge. Therefore, people who accepted communist propaganda with an ideological attitude but became disillusioned with Bolshevik practice and hated it should be selected for a leading role in the liberation revolution.

This attitude is wrong on its very basis. This kind of argument can only be used to assert that an anti-communist revolution in Ukraine is impossible because there is no suitable element for leading cadres. If the leading role in the liberation revolution were to be played by an element that, from an ideological point of view, is in the thrall of communism, it would not be a true anti-Bolshevik revolution, but only a purification and rehabilitation of the communist system by revolutionary means, and national-state independence would be immediately replaced by national communism. But this whole tendency will remain only a theoretical chatter, because it has no basis in reality. The fundamental error lies in the thesis that the element that stands out in the Bolshevik system by its activity, dynamism and creates a ruling stratum, at least in the lower and middle levels of the Bolshevik state machine, is suitable for a leading role, or even active participation in the anti-Bolshevik revolution. It is equally false to think that the cadre of Bolshevik activists includes all the naturally capable and active people. In both cases, there is a flatly mechanical approach to problems.

Even in normal, free living conditions, people's activity and abilities are rarely universal, usually they have a certain direction. Especially in completely abnormal

n the circumstances of Bolshevik totalitarianism, dictatorship, in a system of general terror and fear, the natural human ability, the drive to be active, can develop and manifest itself legally either in the direction prescribed by the communist doctrine and the Bolshevik regime, or seek opportunities in areas of creativity and work in the encroachment of communism is still relatively small.

In various non-political sectors, one can find many decent, worthwhile people in prominent positions. But in the sectors where political issues are most acute - in the Communist Party and in the state administration - two types of people dominate: committed communists and ideological careerists who serve the Bolsheviks for their own personal gain. Neither type of person can have a place, let alone a leading role, in the Ukrainian national liberation revolution.

Our struggle must be based on the active and leading participation of only ideologically valuable, patriotic, anti-communist elements. There are many of them in Ukraine. Those who are not covered by the conspiratorial action of the nationalist revolutionary underground are trying to carry out some nationally useful work, and some hide their true attitude behind a mask of passive disinterest, inability, or incapacity. Not all people who behave passively, inactively, or appear stupid in sub-Bolshevik reality are so by nature. The Bolshevik system made many of them so, or forced them to pretend to be so. It does not allow them to develop their natural abilities, nor to be active in a direction that would be to their liking, that would be in line with their patriotic and moral guidance, and their national conscience does not allow them to deploy all their abilities and strength in the service of the Bolsheviks.

The most important, fundamental act of the Ukrainian national revolution is precisely that it will break these shackles, which the enemy uses to bind the Ukrainian individual as well as the entire nation. The liberation struggle opens up a wide field for countless individuals to unleash their natural abilities and suppressed energy in the struggle for the freedom of Ukraine. The ideas of Ukrainian nationalism and the heroic deeds of the revolutionary struggle awaken the energy and highest values of Cossack descendants, deeply asleep and chained by Bolsheviks. The plough of the national revolution will plough a lifetime, and

Most importantly, it will bring to the surface new, suppressed forces, new talents, new active and leading cadres. The main asset and leading element of the liberation revolution will be the Yaremas and Halaidas (Yarema is a figure from Shevchenko's poem "The Haidamaks" who obeyed his master in Jewish hire, but when he joined the Haidamaks, where he received the pseudonym "Halaida", he became a brave fighter for the freedom of his people). The fact that Bolshevism made them slaves, forced them to hide their desires, thoughts, and the true intentions of their work. In the course of the liberation revolution, they would become Galaidas - prominent participants in the struggle for the freedom of Ukraine. These transformations and rebirths are ongoing. The process of continuation, development and spread of the Ukrainian nationalist movement, its liberation revolutionary struggle, is precisely the fact that, despite all the enemy's efforts to destroy it, despite the constant highest sacrifices, its ideas are spreading further and further, the ranks of active fighters are growing, because more and more new forces are joining it. The struggle generates and mobilises new fighters, and the fighters generate the struggle. This is a continuous chain process that engages ever wider circles of people, regardless of the various changes in the forms of revolutionary action. And its unchanging and unassailable engine is the great ideas of Ukrainian nationalism. These ideas, acting in the dynamic form of revolutionary struggle, mobilise and form the active and leading cadres of the modern liberation struggle of Ukraine.

## **The commander is a leader (in the footsteps of the memory of Roman Shukhevych)**

*This article was published with the signature of St. Bandera's signature, first of all in the weekly "Way of Victory", Munich, pp. 2, 4, 5, 6 for March-April 1954, year I, then in the collection "For an Independent Ukraine", as a special edition of the Library of the Ukrainian Underground, edition of the Foreign Mastinas of the OUN, 1957, and later in the monthly "Liberation Path", London, year XII/XVIII, book 3/205 for March 1965. An excerpt from the article was also published in "The Way of Victory", Munich, year of publication. XV, no. 11 (734), 17 March 1968.*

### **I**

The figure of Hon. Roman Shukhevych is one of the most prominent figures in the history of the nationalist revolutionary liberation movement, and in the turning points of the last twenty years, its symbol and guiding light. Roman Shukhevych played an important role in the development of the liberation movement in its previous periods, and in the most important period - from the beginning of the last war to the present day - he gave it direction and directly led it.

In the thirties, from the 1st Congress of the until 1933, the revolutionary liberation underground in western Ukraine was engaged in an internal struggle for the content, form and organisation of the further liberation struggle. After almost a decade of combat activity by the UVO (Ukrainian Military Organisation), the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists came into being. The competition between the two tendencies began and disputes, many times heated, between their spokespersons and supporters. A general consciousness had already been established among the membership that it was inexpedient to limit revolutionary action to militant formations, as it was inexpedient to leave the political field of struggle to the existing legal parties of the opportunist trend, that instead it was necessary to launch a broad revolutionary political action and create an underground ideological and political organisation with a nationalist ideology and a revolutionary liberation political concept. In terms of the need to create an organisation of Ukrainian nationalists in western Ukraine, the OUN did not

There were no doubts or disputes.

The issue was different. One current was replacing the organisational and action parallelism of the UVO-UN. The two organisations were to exist separately, with a delimited field of activity, separate forms and methods of action, and only the leaders themselves were to be coordinated.

The OUN, which would carry out ideological, educational, political and propaganda work in the spirit of independence and revolutionary nationalism, but which would not be organisationally linked to the revolutionary and militant UVO and its acts, despite its illegal, underground methods of action and forms of work, would have a freer attitude and wider opportunities for development under Polish occupation.

The second stream replaced the concept of the consistent unanimity of the revolutionary liberation movement under every review. All struggles had to be based on one ideology, one programme, one liberation political concept. All forms of struggle - in the ideological, national-political, propaganda, educational, military and combat areas - should be carried out in a unified manner, reinforcing and complementing each other. This was ensured by the unanimous revolutionary organisation - the OUN, and the UVO, as one of the sectors of the struggle, which gained full significance and value only through its ideological and political foundation and superstructure, was to become the military and combat department of the OUN.

In the competition between these two movements, the concept of unanimity prevailed. The position of Roman Shukhevych was of particular importance in this regard. He, one of the most prominent active militants and members of the UVO, had a great moral influence on the ranks of the UWists. Supporters of the separateness and parallelism of the UVO-UN tried to bring Roman Shukhevych to their side and nominate him as their main representative. However, he was more concerned with understanding the need to further develop the liberation movement than with personal friendships. He, a Ukrainian nationalist from the depths of his own convictions, having a knightly disposition to look far ahead, also considered the issue of current activities in terms of plans for a distant goal. Roman Shukhevych, a member of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, already then foresaw ways to expand the revolutionary liberation movement of the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists, which was to become, and did become, a further development of the

UWO, taking over its very tradition, struggle, heritage and personnel.

The turning point in the development of the revolutionary liberation movement in western Ukraine ended with a good result - complete organisational, action and ideological unanimity of the UVO-OUN. The main areas of the UVO's activities at that time - military actions and military education and training - became the references of the OUN. This happened in 1933. In the OUN Regional Executive Committee in Western Ukraine, the military referent was appointed to the position of Mykhailo Kolodzynsky, and after his departure abroad - Hon. Dmytro Hrytsai (Gen. Perebyte). The combat referee was Col. Roman Shukhevych-Dzvin.

Further developments confirmed the correctness of the direction of the current advocated by Roman Shukhevych. The end of this process gave the nationalist movement in the western Ukrainian lands a great accelerating force, helped it to expand from prominent acts of war to political and revolutionary actions in which the broad masses of the people took an active part, and at the same time deepened its ideological and political content and strengthened its organisational and action cohesion.

## //

In the last years before the outbreak of the Second World War, the OUN in western Ukraine experienced a new crisis. The nationalist movement gained great influence among the Ukrainian people, activating the masses to fight the occupiers with revolutionary methods.

The organisation and its active personnel gained a great deal of momentum for the development of an ever-widening revolutionary struggle. However, the then leader of the OUN Regional Executive in Western Ukraine (The then leader of the Regional Executive, i.e. the leading factor of the OUN in Western Ukraine, which was subordinate to the Leadership of Ukrainian Nationalists - PUN, headed by Col. S. Konovalets, who was in exile, was Lev Rebet) opposed this, working to stop revolutionary actions, not only combat, but also mass political, revolutionary and propaganda actions. In connection with this and some other phenomena, a serious crisis arose - resentment and distrust in the ranks of the Organisation in western Ukraine towards the National Leadership, which resulted in the need for personal changes.

At that time, the leading OUN activists in western Ukraine unanimously expressed a desire for the OUN Regional Executive to be headed by Roman Shukhevych, a combat referent of the previous Regional Executive who had been released from prison shortly before, after being convicted at the Lviv trial. Through all his previous activities in the UVO and OUN, his demonstrated qualities of an unwavering and determined nationalist leader, a very capable and skilful organiser, and a determined militant, he had gained the full support of the Ukrainian government. Roman Shukhevych gained the full trust, authority and loyalty of the OUN staff and Ukrainian society, which was favourably disposed towards the OUN's struggle. Therefore, the OUN in the Western Ukrainian lands with faith and confidence expected Roman Shukhevych-Bell to lead it along the firm but correct path of intensified revolutionary struggle in all areas, as required by the political world situation of the time and, in particular, the situation in the Western Ukrainian lands. This was, after all, what the Organization and the people wanted. The OUN leader, Col. Svhen Konovalts, fervently wanted Roman Shukhevych to become the leader of the OUN in western Ukraine, whom he valued very highly and had full trust and sympathy for.

Roman Shukhevych obeyed this general desire of the Organisation and agreed to take on a responsible and difficult post, although it was much harder for him than for anyone else. He was already completely disguised, well known to the enemy. After his release from prison, he was constantly followed by the enemy police. Consequently, he had to search for and apply completely new, improved methods of underground life and action so that his further revolutionary activities, including his leadership, would not be immediately discovered by the enemy. This is what he was planning and preparing. But these plans did not come true. Roman Shukhevych did not take over the leadership of the OUN in western Ukrainian lands because the previous leader of the OUN Regional Executive Committee in western Ukrainian lands did not agree to transfer functions in a way that would ensure the legitimacy of his further personal occupation of this post.

Nevertheless, the decision to appoint Roman Shukhevych as the leader of the Regional Executive had a decisive positive impact on the further development of the Organisation and its activities in western Ukraine. The breakthrough was complete. Along with the decision to make a necessary personal change in the position of the Regional Leader, there were

The plan, direction, and style of further activity were also changed. Instead of frailty, stagnation, internal isolation and inactivity, a new course had to emerge, which was represented and embodied by Roman Shukhevych: decisive, dynamic activity, a broad scope of revolutionary activity, uncompromising and straightforwardness in independent policy, ideological purity and clarity, and above all

- The truth, that is, the coherence of deeds with words, the elimination of phraseological chatter. Roman Shukhevych completed the breakthrough that other numerous leading OUN leaders in western Ukraine sought but could not achieve by his own decision to take over the post of Regional Leader.

Leaders of the same spirit, direction, and style in the revolutionary liberation struggle as Roman Shukhevych came to this leadership position. First and foremost, the late Turash, and after his, still unexplained, death on the way back to the region from a conference with the OUN leadership abroad, his deputy, Ser. Volodymyr Tymchiy-Lopatinsky. In a short time, they directed the development and struggle of the OUN in western Ukraine on the path that Roman Shukhevych had intended. Shukhevych. As a result, the Organisation in the Western Ukrainian lands entered the Second World War strengthened, dynamic, prepared for a broad armed political revolutionary struggle, and its leadership - the Regional Executive - vigorously seized the initiative and the helm. The Regional Leader Tymchiy-Lopatinsky, his military advisor, was a member of the

At the beginning of the war, Kreminsky and other leaders from the Regional Executive prepared and led the OUN for broad revolutionary and guerrilla actions, for a strong rise and manifestation of the national and state aspirations of the broad masses during the transitional stage of changing occupations in the Western Ukrainian lands, and then for laying solid foundations for the direct revolutionary struggle against Ukraine's main enemy, Bolshevik Moscow.

### ///

At that time, Roman Shukhevych emerged in another centre of the liberation and statehood struggle of the Ukrainian nation - its farthest western branch, in Zakarpattia. Building an independent national and state life of Carpathian Ukraine, the struggle to maintain it

— cannot be the subject of this article. This has its own separate historical coverage, and the role, work and struggle of those members of the OUN who rushed from other areas, in particular from western Ukrainian lands, to work and fight together with their Transcarpathian friends, should also have a place of honour. In their first ranks, we see three of the most prominent leaders, members of the OUN, namely. Zenon Kossak, sgt. Mykhaylo Kolodzinsky and RAF Colonel Roman Shukhevych. All three of them, along with other friends, wholeheartedly devoted themselves to building an independent state life of Carpathian Ukraine, and above all to its internal strengthening by organising dedicated nationalist personnel and creating the military strength of the young state

— Carpathian Sich. When, as a result of Hitler's trade in Carpathian Ukraine, an enemy armed attack on it came, the three nationalist leaders, together with all their fellow fighters, engaged in an unequal armed struggle. Among the many heroic defenders of the state independence of Carpathian Ukraine, Messrs. Kossak and Kolodzinsky were among the many heroic defenders of the state independence of the Carpathian Ukraine. Roman Shukhevych was destined to continue the struggle for the freedom of the whole of Ukraine and to accomplish many more great deeds in this struggle.

Roman Shukhevych began to work and fight for the state of Carpathian Ukraine, just as he had done before and after, in other territories of the Ukrainian land, as the first of the first. He was guided by the consciousness that the struggle of the Ukrainian people for their freedom, for state independence and for unity is one and indivisible.

No matter which front, which branch of the people which generation, against which enemy, and in which political constellation this struggle takes place, if it has one, single goal - an Independent, Unified Ukrainian State - then it is a segment of the one-point struggle of the Ukrainian nation for its rights, for freedom, and for truth. Roman Shukhevych knew that this struggle would lead to victory when the people would lead it unceasingly and steadfastly, when the struggle would be waged with the greatest intensity on all fronts, in all territories and time periods.

Roman Shukhevych was a blood and bone fighter for the liberation cause, so we see him in the first ranks where this struggle was burning with fire. He was — by natural gift and vocation - a leader. Therefore, he naturally mobilised and organised the ranks of numerous fighters,

inspired them with faith, perseverance, and sacrifice, leading them to an organised competition.

#### IV

The first years of the Second World War marked an important period in the history of the OUN and, in particular, the activities of one its most prominent figures, Hon. Roman Shukhevych. In the period between the German-Polish and German-Soviet wars, from autumn 1939 to spring 1941, the main preparations were made for the broad deployment of the liberation and revolutionary struggle. This deployment reached its peak at the end of the war and in the first two postwar years.

From the moment the Bolsheviks occupied the western Ukrainian lands, the OUN in this part of Ukraine reorganised its activities with the greatest energy and haste, in accordance with the new situation.

The organisation was fully and directly involved in the main front of the liberation struggle against Bolshevik Moscow. Along with political content, it was also necessary to strengthen the forms of revolutionary struggle and methods of underground activity. Along with the first units of the Soviet army, the Bolsheviks sent a large number of NKVEDists to the western Ukrainian lands, trained in advance to crush the OUN. The study of the Bolshevik system, the methods of the NKVD, in particular the methods of the most refined provocation planned for a distant goal, cost the Organisation many victims and failures. But the OUN withstood the competition. The Bolsheviks failed to break it, to deprive it of its base of development and action, while it developed a new strategy and tactics of underground struggle and existence. Despite the large and very heavy losses in membership, including among the leading ones, the OUN under the leadership of the Regional Leader, Ser. Legenda-Klymov, not only survived and gained a foothold in the western Ukrainian lands before the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, but also made significant preparations for military revolutionary actions in the further development of the war and expanded its activities to part of the central and eastern Ukrainian lands.

The continuity and success of the OUN's activities under Bolshevik occupation was largely supported and strengthened by the Organisation's base in those marginal western Ukrainian lands that

— according to the Moscow-Bolshevik condition - were under

German occupation. The OUN paid much attention to the creation and development of such a base outside the Bolshevik occupation, from the very beginning of the Bolshevik occupation of western Ukrainian lands, taking into account various possibilities for further developments.

Already during the movement of the fronts, in the autumn of 1939, the OUN Regional Leadership in western Ukraine sent some of its members to the western side of the German-Soviet demarcation line and instructed them to organise work there. At the same time, a wave of people fleeing Bolshevik persecution sailed there. By organising Ukrainian national life on the western outskirts of Ukrainian lands outside the Bolshevik occupation, forming cadres of members and sympathisers there, and building an underground OUN network in Zakarpattia and among the labour emigrants in Germany, the OUN created a strong support base of its own within a year.

In this work, a very active, leading role was played by Hon. Roman Shukhevych.

From the beginning of 1940, he was a member of the OUN Revolutionary Leadership and in the same year became the Regional Leader in the western peripheral lands, taking over this position after the death of Myron-Orlyk, who retreated to Ukrainian lands under Bolshevik occupation. Managing the activities of the OUN in the ZOUZ (Western Ukrainian Lands), Roman Shukhevych pursued two main directions: first, to develop and elevate all areas of national life to make a lasting contribution to the development of that part of the Ukrainian people that throughout history has defended the Ukrainian state of occupation on the western borders and has been the most oppressive to the Ukrainian national element in all areas for centuries; secondly, to create on the western borders of the Ukrainian land, in a long belt along the border of the Bolshevik occupation, a strong personnel, organisational and logistical base, as an auxiliary front for the OUN's struggle in the motherland and for training personnel for the broader development of the liberation struggle throughout Ukraine in the future, in particular in connection with military events.

The work in both of these areas was completely successful and within a year and a half yielded significant results, which later manifested themselves in the two-front struggle of the OUN during the German-Bolshevik war and in the later struggle of Zakerzonia Ukraine in 1945-48.

In its work among the indigenous Ukrainian population in the western marginal lands, the OUN introduced new methods of hastened national and political uplift. They were distinguished by the fact that instead of a gradual process designed for decades, they simultaneously and simultaneously launched a national educational effort, starting with the teaching of illiterates, and developed cultural, economic, youth and nationalist-political education, while simultaneously organising new cadres of nationalist revolutionaries from the best elements who received ideological, political and military training.

The entire plan of work was based on the fact that the soul of the Ukrainian population on the western borders remained Ukrainian, even in places where national and political consciousness was lulled into sleep, and where, however, the centuries-long struggle against the denationalisation offensive had carved out a firm, unyielding character. This plan of the OUN's work was justified. At first glance, the seemingly dark, nationally unaware Lemkivshchyna, Kholmshchyna, and Podlasie produced a cadre of good nationalist revolutionaries in a short time, and then turned into bastions of several years of fierce struggle against Bolshevism, a struggle for the Ukrainian national character of those borderlands. The entire Ukrainian population took an active part in that struggle, and the enemy could not break it except by massive, forced evictions and dispersal.

From a national political perspective, the work of the OUN in the western marginal lands was very difficult. In the multi-generational struggle there, one-sided national defensive instincts and forces against the constant Polish onslaught were created. But at the same time, Moscow influences took root, instilled and nourished by Moscow for many generations. These influences were manifested earlier in the form of Moscow and then communist work. Using the incessant anti-Polish struggles in those lands, they were moulded to national sentiments and tried to give them a pro-Moscow content. The Bolsheviks, having occupied the western Ukrainian lands, waged a very strong campaign west of the demarcation line to strengthen those influences not only with communist propaganda but also with lies about Ukrainian statehood in the Ukrainian SSR. Additional difficulties were created by the German occupation policy, which tried to harness the revived Ukrainian life and the Ukrainian element to its cart, to serve Hitler's

imperialist plans.

The nationalist cadres managed to overcome all those difficulties, to raise the patriotic mood of the general Ukrainian population of those lands, to purify them from insidious enemy influences and to direct them in the right direction. Nationalist work in those lands spread and established the consciousness that the national liberation struggle of the entire Ukrainian people on all fronts is one and indivisible, that the main enemy of Ukraine is Moscow-Bolshevik imperialism in all its forms, and that the struggle against it is equally important and relevant for those parts of the people who hold other fronts of the national struggle.

The main driving force behind the victory of nationalist influences in those lands was the inner strength and truth of the very idea of Ukrainian nationalism.

But the ideology of the OUN cadres themselves, the truth and consistency of their actions, which were in line with their ideas, and their uncompromising attitude towards all enemies of Ukraine and against hostile foreign intrigues were also important. This made the OUN cadres trusted by the masses.

The fact that the OUN managed to do such an important job in the western marginal lands of Ukraine in a short time (1939-41) between two disruptions of the war, smoothly and successfully, is largely due to the fact that the leaders in those areas were the following.

Myron-Orlyk and Roman Shukhevych.

## V

The year and a half interwar period (from autumn 1939 to spring 1941) in Roman Shukhevych's activity was filled with work in two main areas. His organisational and political activities as a regional leader in those marginal Ukrainian lands were outlined in the previous section.

In addition, it should be mentioned that during the same period Roman Shukhevych for some time served as a liaison officer between the OUN Revolutionary Leadership and the Organisation on Ukrainian lands under Bolshevik occupation.

The second segment of Roman Shukhevych's activities at that time was devoted to military training work, to which he devoted himself entirely

and it brought the best success.

The OUN has always conducted military education and training among its members and supporters, attaching great importance to it. This stemmed from its liberation concept, which outlined the path to Ukraine's state independence through revolutionary, armed political struggle, which should end in a victorious armed uprising of the entire nation. The OUN's military education and training work was facilitated by the fact that it grew out of the Ukrainian Military Organisation and continued its activities.

In a war situation, the liberation struggle is particularly concentrated in military action. From the very beginning of the Second World War, there were signs that the USSR would also take part in that war, and thus the warfare would move to the territories under Bolshevik rule. The military development concealed various possibilities and could create special circumstances for our liberation struggle. The OUN had to be prepared for a full-scale armed struggle. Therefore, in its activities at that time, military training was a key focus on all territories.

Outside of the Bolshevik occupation, OUN military training was concentrated in the western marginal lands and in Poland (in Krakow), as well as in other areas of labour. The first organiser of military labour was szl. Kreminsky, a military referent in the OUN Regional Executive Committee in the Western Ukrainian lands, who organised partisan units during the German-Polish war, and when the Bolsheviks occupied the Western Ukrainian lands, he began to organise a military headquarters and a training centre under the OUN Revolutionary Leadership.

Kreminsky went to Ukraine in early 1940 and was killed in an ambush by the NKVD). The formation of the military centre-headquarters was completed. The military work of the OUN Revolutionary Leadership was headed by: Roman Shukhevych, Dmytro Hrytsay-Perebyinis and Oleksa Gasyn-Lytar. Among others, the following prominent military figures of the Organisation took part in it: Vasyl Sydor-Shelest, Osyp Karachevskyi, Lieutenant Bosyi, Stepan Novytskyi and others.

Roman Shukhevych was the soul and main organiser of the Military Centre, its headquarters, planning, staffing, organisational and baking work. In this work, he demonstrated his outstanding talent and

# **BERSERKER**

---

## **BOOKS**

---

